L. & M.
[illegible]-8-895.

# Local & Munl. (1895.) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

**G.O., No.** 343L

**DATED** 25th Feby 1895.

---

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition.

Informing C. Chenchuramayya, late Local Fund Overseer, Nellore, that no appeal lies to Government in the case of his dismissal from his post by the President of the Nellore District Board.

## BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

---

d Municipal Department.

## PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ memorial ~~dated~~

from C. Chenchuramayya. Late L. F. Overseer Nellore

No. dated 6th February 1895

ORDER— 25.2.95 No. 343

[illegible] of L. F. [illegible] in Nellore [illegible] in any case [illegible] to be [illegible]

The petitioner is informed that under Local Fund rule No. 72, ~~70,~~ 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.~~

V R
15/2/95

~~(True Extract.)~~

Mrg 2.95

21/2/95

~~Assistant Secretary.~~

The Petitioner
Despd. 26/2/95

"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."

Petition of Chenchuramayya, Late L. F. overseer, Nellore, appealing against his dismissal by the Prest. of the D. L. Bd.

422 L

343 L

Local & Municipal Dept.
R. CURRENT No. 422 L

From

C. Chenchuramiah
late Local Fund
overseer, Nellore

To

His Excellency
the Governor in
Council Ft. St.
George Madras.

Dated 6th February 1895
Recd.

~~Bringing to notice~~ Appealing against the order of the ~~that he was unjustly~~ President of the D. L. Bd ~~dismissed by the President~~ dismissing him from his post ~~L. F. D. Board Nellore~~ and praying that he may be restored

A

To

S. H. Wynne Esq. Collector & President
District Board. Nellore

Sir

I beg to submit the following few
lines for your kind consideration before
passing any orders on the complaint against
the measurements of Dorial Road, trusting
that statements made by me in your
presence might be more plainly represented.
Sand. The collection of this material in
17, 18 & 19 miles was commenced after the
18/2/94 and completed before the 26/3/94.
a period of 1¼ months. I measured it
on 27/3/94 day time and the D. B. Engineer
Check-measured the same on the very evening.

As regards to the nearest place from
which it was brought, I had no idea
when I measured that there is sand
any where else except in the River.
I doubted the colour of some heaps at
the

the time of measurement but satisfied when the maistry & Contractor told me that the difference of colour is owing to the mixture of blown dust on the Road.

As the quality of that sand found to be in no way unfit for use on the road, I passed it, but after hearing from the Sub Magistrate that there is sand near Gandavaram channel, I went on the 18th Instant and inspected the place & found that some sand (about 16 units according to the measurement of pits) there removed. I brought it & compared with the heaps in the 1st part of the 17 mile, it appeared to be of the same sort. I now think that the work people might have brought the 16 units mentioned above.

In this case your honor will see that I was not able to find

out

out this at the time of measurement.

As regards to measurements in material the measurements of the Sub Magistrate are, as pointed out to your honor less even in the materials checked by the District Board Engineer.

As regards to earthwork the slight variations may be attributed to taking measurements with rod & tape by unaccustomed measurers or silt in pits if they are dug some time back.

I further beg to say that the earthwork being incomplete was recommended for part payment and will be remeasured when making a final Bill.

In conclusion, I earnestly request your honor to cause few heaps of materials & some pits measured in your presence in any furlong under dispute. This

favour

favour, if accepted, will, I trust prove my innocence in this case and attain the ends of justice

I beg &c

C. Chenchuramiah

L. F. [illegible]

21st April 1894

True Copy

C. Chenchur[illegible]

---

Order No 703 / D.B. dated 25 April 1894 C

recd 27-4-94

No 196 dated 6 April 1894

B

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 488 [illegible]

[illegible] A B

2 [illegible] 4. 7. 8. 10. 12. 13. 17

18. 20 [illegible] 30 [illegible]

1 3 [illegible]

gravel gauge metal quartz metal sand ~~[illegible]~~ earthwork

[illegible] A B C D [illegible]

[illegible]

Voucher No 214 of March 1894. 3 [illegible] Maintenance

for Rs 1232-11-1 [illegible] Maintenance

[illegible]

[illegible] Maintenance Estimate [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] Maintenance

[illegible] 1900 [illegible]

[illegible] 1

[illegible] Special Estimate [illegible] Mourta Cost [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Favour, if accepted, will, I trust
[illegible] in this Case

Order No 703/D.B. dated 25 April 1894 C
Recd 27-4-94

[illegible]

4 Overseer Bill No 120 for [illegible]
No 153-7-1 Rs [illegible]
Rs 21-0-9 [illegible]
[illegible] Measurement [illegible]
Engineering Department [illegible] 20 [illegible] 1/2 [illegible]
[illegible] 13 [illegible] 10 1/4 [illegible] 12 [illegible] 34 1/2
[illegible] 10 [illegible] 13 1/4 [illegible]
[illegible] 10 12 [illegible] Earthwork [illegible]
[illegible] Provision [illegible] 20
[illegible]
[illegible] 58-10 [illegible]
[illegible] Quarry [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] item [illegible]
[illegible]

Overseer Bill No 121 of 1893-94 for No 153-9-8.

(5) 17-18 [illegible]
[illegible] 17 [illegible]
[illegible] 22 1/8 [illegible] 18 [illegible] 24/8 [illegible]
[illegible] Measurement Sheet
[illegible]
[illegible] 17 [illegible] 3 1/8 [illegible] 18 [illegible]
[illegible] 9 1/8 [illegible]
6. 17 18 [illegible] localities [illegible]
[illegible] Main Channel [illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] 17-18 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] local enquiry [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 17-18 [illegible]
[illegible] 17-18 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 2-3 [illegible]
[illegible] 17 18 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

1 1/2

favour, if accepted, will, I trust

[illegible] 17/18 [illegible]

[illegible] local enquiry [illegible]

[illegible] 4 - 4 1/3 [illegible] Cartage

[illegible] 17 - 18 [illegible]

Provide [illegible]

[illegible] suspension [illegible]

[illegible] 17/18 [illegible] 1 1/2 [illegible]

7 [illegible]

---

Order No 703 / D.B dated 25 April 1894 C

recd 27 - 4 - 94

8 [illegible] laterite guage metal quartz metal

gravel [illegible]

[illegible] Engineering Deptt [illegible]

[illegible] the different [illegible]

Comparative statement [illegible] 8 [illegible] 6.7.8

[illegible] 13 [illegible] 1 . 2 . 5 . 6 . 7 [illegible]

[illegible] 11 [illegible]

[illegible] provision [illegible]

[illegible] Extra [illegible]

[illegible] Extra

9 [illegible] heap

[illegible] length Breadth bottom base 4 ft high

[illegible] length [illegible]

[illegible] base & high [illegible]

10 Overseer's Bill No 106 & 121 of 1893-94

[illegible] 23/4 [illegible]

[illegible] Overseer [illegible]

2 [illegible] Measurement sheet [illegible]

Stack 23/4 [illegible] old Stack 1 1/2

[illegible]

favour, if accepted, will, I trust

Quantity [illegible] 5 3/4 [illegible]

[illegible] 2 3/4 — 1/2 [illegible] 1/4 [illegible]

[illegible]

11 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(Sd) [illegible] Seetaramaswami

Stationary Sub-Magistrate

Copy app 16/6/94

Delivery 10/7/94

(True Copy)

Churchill

Order No 703/D.B. dated 25 April 1894 C

recd 27-4-94

[illegible]

| [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 | 1 | 1 | 30 | 8 | 3 1/2 | 360 | |
| | | 2 | 12 | 11 | 1 | 132 | |
| | | 3 | 17 | 9 | 1 | 153 | |
| | | 4 | 27 | 5 3/4 | 1 | 155 1/4 | |
| | | | | | | 800 1/4 | -- 8 |
| 13 | 4 | 1 | 11 | 7 | 5/4 | 96 1/4 | |
| | | 2 | 64 | 11 | 3/2 | 1056 | |
| | | 3 | 118 | 9 | 1 | 1062 | |
| | | | | | | 2214 | -- 22 |
| | 3 | 1 | 20 | 15 | 3/4 | 375 | |
| | | 2 | 36 | 7 | 3/2 | 378 | |
| | | 3 | 48 | 9 | 5/4 | 540 | |
| | | 4 | 14 | 8 1/2 | 1 3/8 | 163 5/8 | |
| | | 5 | 39 | 6 | 1 | 234 | |
| | | 6 | 18 | 7 | 3/4 | 94 1/2 | |
| | | 7 | 38 | 7 | 1 | 266 | |
| | | 8 | 65 | 8 | 3/4 | 390 | |
| | | 9 | 116 | 8 | 3/2 | 1392 | |
| | | | | | | 3833 1/8 | |
| | | | | | Total of 13 [illegible] | 60.47 or $60\frac{1}{2}$ units. | |
| 12 | 6 | 1 | 12 | 9 | 3/4 | 81 | |
| | | 2 | 15 | 14 | 1 ~~1/2~~ 1/4 | 262 1/2 | |
| | | 3 | 17 | 16 | 1 1/2 | ~~5~~ 4 08 | |
| | | 4 | 10 | 7 | 1 1/4 | 87 1/2 | |
| | | 5 | 10 | 10 | 1 1/4 | 125 | |
| | | 6 | 53 | 6 | 1 1/4 | 3 ~~8~~ 9 7 1/2 | |
| | | 7 | 12 | 6 | 5/6 | 60 | |
| | | 8 | 12 | 9 | $1\frac{1}{6}$ | 126 | |
| | | 9 | 247 | 6 | $1\frac{1}{3}$ | 1976 | |
| | | 10 | 138 | 4 | 1 | 552 | |
| | | 11 | 166 | 6 | 1 | 996 | |
| | | 12 | 265 | 6 | 1 | 1590 | |

favour, if accepted, will, I trust

Order No 703/D.B. dated 25 April 1894 C
recd 27-4-94

| [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] | [illegible] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ⓒ | 5 | 1 | 108 | 6 | 1 | 648 |
| | | 2 | 54 | 9 | 1 | 486 |
| | | 3 | 10 | 9 | 1¼ | 112½ |
| | | 4 | 85 | 9 | 1 1/6 | 892½ |
| | | 5 | 21 | 9 | 1 1/6 | 220½ |
| | | 6 | 92 | 10 | 1½ | 1449 |
| | | 7 | 43 | 8½ | 1 1/6 | 426 5/12 |
| | | 8 | 26 | 7 | 1½ | 223 |
| | | | | | | 4507¾ |
| | 4 | 1 | 153 | 8 | 1¼ | 1530 |
| | | 2 | 77 | 5 | 1 | 385 |
| | | 3 | 98 | 8 | 1¼ | 980 |
| | | | | | | 2895 |
| 10 | 8 | 1 | 62 | 9 | 1½ | 837 |
| | 7 | 1 | 54 | 8½ | 1½ | 688½ |
| | | 2 | 18 | 9 | 1½ | 243 |
| | | 3 | 117 | 9 | 1½ | 1579½ |
| | | | | | | 2511 |
| | 6 | 1 | 46 | 6 | 1½ | 414 |
| | | 2 | 25 | 9 | 1¼ | 281¼ |
| | | 3 | 35 | 6 | 1¼ | 262½ |
| | | 4 | 70 | 6 | 1 1/3 | 560 |
| | | 5 | 20 | 6 | 1¼ | 150 |
| | | 6 | 36 | 7 | 1 | 252 |
| | | 7 | 35 | 6 | ¾ | 157½ |
| | | 8 | 44 | 9 | 1¼ | 495 |
| | | 9 | 116 | 9 | 1¼ | 1218 |
| | | 10 | 44 | 9 | 11/12 | 363 |
| | | | | | | 4153¼ |
| | 5 | 1 | 62 | 6 | 1½ | 403 |
| | | 2 | 86 | 6 | 1 | 516 |
| | | 3 | 63 | 6 | 1¼ | 472½ |
| | | | | | | 1391½ |

12 — 1464 5/12 of 141 cents

10 — 8892 3/4 3 — 89

No signature in the original
S. L. Seetaraman
Stationary [illegible]

favour, if accepted, will, I trust

Order No 703/B.B dated 25 April 1894 C
recd 27-4-94

8

| Mile | F. | Metal<br>Heap | Sunk | Gravel<br># 2. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 1 | 6 | 101 1/4 | |
| | 2 | 1 | 31 7/8 | |
| | | 1 | 56 7/8 | |
| | | 1 | 63 1/2 | |
| | 3 | 1st | 48 3/4 | |
| | | 2 | 52 1/2 | |
| | | 3 | 13 1/8 | |
| | | 4 | 9 3/8 | |
| | | 5 | 63 3/4 | |
| | | | 187 1/2 | |
| | 4 | 1 | 123 3/4 | 1st 11 1/4 |
| | | 2 | 78 3/4 | |
| | | 3 | 65 5/8 | |
| | | 4 | 50 5/8 | |
| | | 5 | 33 7/16 | |
| | | | 352 3/16 | |
| | 2 | 1 | 42 1/2 | |
| | | 2 | 22 1/2 | |
| | | | 65 | |
| | 5 | 1 | 52 1/2 | |
| | | 2 | 10 | |
| | | 3 | 36 | |
| | | 4 | 58 1/8 | |
| | | 5 | 14 1/16 | |
| | | | 170 11/16 | |

f

4th ~~#~~ 6 1 18 3/4 1 16 7/8
2 16 7/8
3 35 5/8
4 15
5 90
6 31
256 1/4 16 7/8

Total of 4 Mile 1275 1/8
12 3/4 units
28 1/2 on
9 3/12 units

7th 1st 1 61 7/8 1st 10
2 40 25/32 2 15
3 48
4 56 1/4
5 54 3/8
6 12
7 9
8 22 1/2
9 11 1/4
316 1/32 25

2f 1 6 3/4 1 8
2 9 2 8 3/4
3 18
4 28 1/8
5 42 3/16
6 25 1/2
129 9/16 16 3/4

7th 3f 1st 33 3/4 1st 8
2 47 3/16 2 12 1/2
3 8 3/4 3 7
4 52 1/2 4 6
5 24 7/8 5 5 1/4
6 13 1/8 6 7
7 30 7 2 1/2
209 11/16 52 3/4

4 1 33 3/4 1 10 15/16
2 37 1/2 2 13 1/8
3 15 3 12
86 1/4 36 1/16

5 1 125 5/8 1 14 1/16
2 46 1/4 2 11 1/4
3 43 3/4 3 10 15/16
4 54 11/16 4 9
5 61 7/8 5 10 15/16
6 40 6 14 1/16
7 45 7 8
8 61 7/8 8 10
499 1/16 88 1/4

6 1 9 3/8 1 8 3/4
2 45 5/16 2 9
3 43 3/4 3 10
4 26 4 "
5 31 7/8 5 8
156 15/16 40 3/4

Total of 7 Mile 1376 29/32 276 9/16

8th 5 1 15 1 10 15/16
2 15 2 3/4
3 15 3 3/4
4 14 1/16
5 15
6 15
7 13 1/8
8 15
9 16 7/8
10 31 7/8
11 15
12 28 5/8
209 1/16 12 7/16

6, 7, 8 furlongs Metal already spread a heap of 11 1/4 cft in the 6th & another of 12 1/2 cft in the 8 f. of quartz Metal alone none exists.

13th 8 1st 74 1/4 1st 6
2 74 1/4 2 10
3 74 1/4 3 48 3/4
4 72 4 6
5 72 5 9 3/8
6 94 1/2 6 33 3/8
7 18 7 6
8 54 8 39 1/16
9 56 1/4 9 40 5/8
10 54 10 63 3/4
11 56 1/4 11 7
12 54 12 12 7/16
13 54

favour, if accepted, will, I trust

14 110 1/4 14, 35 5/8
5 15 52 1/2

918 1/4 427 5/8

1, 2, 5, 6, 7 furlongs already spread.

Total of 13 mile 918 1/4 427 5/8
or or
9 1/4 units 4 1/4 units

Nellore 5/8/94

(True copy

---

Order No 703/D.B dated 25 April 1894 C
recd 27-4-94

Comparative statement of Metal Statement D.

| Mile | Nature Metal | Quantity arranged | As now measured | Differ | Rate | Total differen in value | Remarks — |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 Mile | L. G. Metal | 20 | 12 3/4 | 7 1/4 | 2-15-1 | 21-5-4 | |
| | gravel | 1/2 | 9/32 | 7/3 | 2-8-6 | 0-8-0 | |
| 7 Mile | L. G. M | 26 1/4 | 13 3/4 | 12 1/4 | 4-9-4 | 57-4-8 | |
| | gravel | 1 1/2 + 5 3/4 | 2 3/4 of which 1/2 old stock | 6 | 4-2-9 | 25-2-6 | Vide measurement Bill & 121 of 93-94 |
| 8 Mile | Quartz | 3 1/4 | 2 1/10 | 1 3/20 | 4-11-9 | 5-6-6 | |
| | gravel | 1/4 | 1/8 | 1/8 | 2-14-3 | 0-5-9 | |
| 6, 7, 8 f. | Metal<br>gravel<br>~~of~~ | 57 1/2<br>30 | spread | | | | |
| 9 M | 1, 2, 3 f.<br>gravel | 22 3/4 | spread | | | | |
| | 4, 6, 7, 8 furlongs Quartz | 3/4 | 1 3/8 | 1 13/20 | 4-8-3 | 7-6-8 | |
| | gravel | 1 1/4 | 1/4 | 1 | 2-5-6 | 2-5-6 | |
| | | | | | | 119-12-11 | |
| 13 M | 8 furlongs | 12 3/4 | 9 1/4 | 3 1/2 | 3-0-9 | 10-10-7 | |
| | gravel | 9 3/4 | 4 1/4 | 5 1/2 | 1-2-3 | 6-4-4 | |
| 12, | 5, 6, 7 f.<br>Metal<br>gravel | 46 1/2<br>29 3/4 | spread | | | | |

favour, if accepted, will, I trust

Order No $\frac{7\cdot3}{D\cdot B}$ dated 25 April 1894 C
recd 27-4-94

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 M | Earthwork | 8 1/8 | 8 | 1/2 | 0-4-3 | 0-2-1 1/2 |
| 13 M | do | 70 3/4 | 60 1/2 | 10 1/4 | 0-4-3 | 3-11-6 1/2 |
| 12 M | do | 175 1/2 | 141 | 34 1/2 | 0-4-3 | " |
| 18 | | 102 1/4 | 8 | 13 1/4 | -4-3 | |
| 17 | Sand | 25 1/4 | 22 1/8 | 3 1/8 | 2-8-9 | 7-15-4 |
| 18 | do | 27 1/2 | 24 5/8 | 2 7/8 | 2-6-0 | 7-1-3 |

15-0-7

48-5-0

119-12-11

168-~~4~~ 11-15-0-7

~~Balance~~
Net 153-1-4
12-7-10 1/2

140-9-6

| M | F | metal<br>ft g. | gravel<br>ft | d |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | 1,2,3 | Metal absent<br>gravel being spread | | |
| | | 4 Cart loads of gravel were carted on the day of inspection stacked in the centre of the road | | |
| 4 | 1st | 12 1/2 | 1 | 8 3/4 |
| | 2 | 17 13/16 | | |
| | | 29 11/16 | | 8 3/4 |
| 6 | 1st | 19 1/2 | 12 | 5 |
| | 2 | 7 1/2 | | |
| | | 20 | | 5 |
| 7 | 1st | 7 1/2 | 1st | 2 1/4 |
| | 2 | 7 1/2 | | |
| | | 15 | | 2 1/4 |
| 8 | 1st | 12 1/2 | 1.2 | 3 |
| | 2 | 12 1/2 | 2 | 3 |
| | 3 | 28 1/8 | 3 | 3 |
| | 4 | 38 1/4 | | |
| | | | | 9 |

Total gravel 91 3/8

Quantity measured 156 1/16 metal or 2..
25 gravel or 1/4 ... 13/5 ...

(True Copy) C. Ahuelin S

E. [illegible]

favour, if accepted, will, I trust

Order No 7-2 / A.B dated 25 April 1894 6
recd 27-4-94

[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 28 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1/2 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
3-4-94

True Copy

favour, if accepted, will, I trust

[illegible]

( True Copy / C. Chenchuramiah 3-4-94

---

Order No 7-3 / D.B dated 25 April 1894 C
recd 27-4-94

S. H. Wynne Esquire Collector &
President District Board, Nellore

To The Local Fund overseer, Nellore Taluq
through the District Board Engineer, Nellore

Mr W. Booth Local Fund Supervisor of Naidupett Division and C. Chenchuramiah Local Fund overseer, Nellore Taluq are dismissed from service from 24th April 1894, for the reasons given in the Proceedings of the President District Board No. 444 dated 24th April 1894.

(Sd) P. J. Pope
Assistant Collector
for President

( True Copy )

C. Chenchuramiah
late L. F. Ov

Proceedings No 444/DB dated 24th April 1894 C.D

Read report from the Dy. Tahasildar of Nellore 196/6-4-94 with connected papers overseers statements &c.

Read office note of Local audit Branch (despatched 7th March) on 56 A (bill)/aud dated 1st March.

Read Supervisor Mr. Booths explanation thereon dated 4th March 1894

Read Supervisors further Explanation (with Sketch attached) dated 16th April 1894.

Read No 380/L.W. dated 15th February 1894

Read Supervisors explanation dated 7 March 1894.

Read overseer Subbarayudus letter dated 26 March 1894.

Read note of Supervisors oral statement on the above matter at hearing 21st April 1894

Read notes of explanations of overseers Chentsuramya & Supervisor Mr. Booth made at hearing dated 21st April 1894

Read again office note (L.W. Branch) on petition 541(456)/RE(L.W.) of 1894 and order thereon.

Order

The

The above papers relate to various matters connected with the management of the Nayudupett Sub Division.

2. The first set of papers belongs to the Special Repairs of Dornal Road 1st Section during last year. Complaints were made to me about the work and I deputed the Deputy Tahasildar of Nellore to make measurements and check and examine the work. His report discloses the most deliberate frauds. One of the items in the estimate and in the bills was sand which was to be carted from the River Pennaier to the 17th & 18th miles a distance of 4 to 4/3 miles. The Dy. Tahasildar found the sand to be an inferior quality much mixed with black earth and took depositions from all the bandymen who carted it and they are unanimous in stating that the sand was brought by them from the Gandavaram Channel a distance of only 1 to 1/2 miles. With the sand in that Channel the sand found corresponds and there cannot be any

doubt

doubt it was from the Channel and not from the River the sand was brought. The overseer in his statement before me admits that 16 units of sand were taken from the Channel bank and says he could not find it out because the Contractor told him that the blackness of the sand was due to its being mixed with road earth and he believed the statement. This would at once prove his unfitness for the post. A man so careless and indifferent as his own statement shows him to be would be merely a cause of loss to the Board but the further inspection of the Dy. Tahasildar discloses facts which make it impossible to accept this explanation as there has evidently been systematic fraud throughout. Statement D shows difference of measurements found by the Dy. Tahasildar on various miles between those made by himself and those shown in the overseers measurements. In some cases spreading was completed

and

and it was impossible to check. In one case the contractor was found on the day of inspection carting extra gravel and when he was asked why he was doing this after bills were drawn for the materials as provided in the estimate; he said he was doing it at his own cost to bring the road into a good state as the provision made was insufficient. There can be little doubt that an attempt was being made to make good the deficiency, the fact that an inspection was ordered having transpired and this ridiculous explanation being the only one which the contractor could think off.

3. The statement D above referred to shows that on the 4th mile the Dy Tahasildar found on measurement 12¾ units of laterite gauge metal, whereas the overseer measured and billed for 20 units. It must be here noted that a very strange

---

Dy. Tahasildar, an excess in every measurement. In the 2d pit of the 4 furlong the

---

[illegible] hit of the system of measurements of metal, gr prevails in this district. The following is an extract from the standard specification originally prepared by Mr. Dumphy Local Fund Engineer which has obtained ever since — the material will be gauged with a chain 33⅓ feet long and a gauge board. No measurements will be taken and if the heaps do not coincide with the specification, the heaps will either be rejected or calculated as 3/4, 1/2 or 1/4 units (of 100 cubic feet) according to the approximate size of the heap. A system better calculated to facilitate fraud than could not well be. Each heap is entered in one column of the measurement ect according to its estimate size 1/4, 1/2, 3/4 or 1, the number of such heaps is placed in the next column and the two being multiplied

and it was impossible to check. In
one case the contractor

400 per cent. On the 8th furlong of the
13th mile he found quartz metal 9¼ units
against 12¾ measured by overseer an excess
of nearly 38 per cent.

5. On the same length he found
4¼ units of gravel against 9¾ units
shown by overseer, an excess of over 115
per cent. For all these items the overseer
can give no other explanation than a
statement that his measurements are
correct.

6. In the case of earthwork I am able
to compare the actual measurements
made in each pit as a similar device
for evading tape measurements to that
noted above in the case of metal and
gravel has not been invented here in
the case of earthwork. On the 13th m
for instance the overseer shows a to
70¾ units against 60½ units mea
by the Dy. Tahasildar. On comp
pit measurements it is found on

---

Dy. Tahasildar, an excess in every measu-
-rement. In the 2nd pit of the 4th furlong the
measurements agree. In the 3rd pit of the
same furlong, the length & breadth agree
but there is a difference of ½ a foot (1 x 1½)
in the depth. In the 6th furlong of the
12th mile the measurements agree while
on the 11th pit the overseer's figures 180x6x,
while the Dy. Tahasildar found 166x6x
These facts are very significant. It is
impossible to account for difference in
14 ft in length on any supposition
except fraud and the fact that in
several cases measurements agree show
that no explanation of incorrect tape
&c or incorrect system of measurement
would hold. The overseer in fact
says that he cannot explain the
discrepancies. There are a number
of other differences, the aggregate
the overseer's measurements on the 10
13th and 17th miles being 357 and th
of the Dy. Tahasildar being 27
the

and it was impossible

the excess being nearly 20 percent. In
one case the Dy. Tahasildar's measurement
was in length 2 ft longer than the overseer's
Presumably earth was taken from it after
the overseer measured. In any case nothing
could make the pits stretch after the
overseer measured them.

7. Metal & gravel were check measured
by Mr Booth the supervisor and the only
explanation he has is that he measured
according to the rules estimating the size
of the heap as provided in the specification.
But however rough that system of gauging
heaps may be, such enormous differen
and all in one direction in favour of the
contractor and against the Local Board
cannot be accounted for by any thing except
fraud in the first instance and fraud
or complete neglect of work in check measurement.

8. Due notice was given to the overseer
of the intended inspection. On the 1st day
(3rd March) he did not appear and
did inspect work. The contractor
was however present at the measurements
of the 4th, 7th, 8th, 9th & 13 miles. The Dy.

The Dy. Tahasil
his only explanation was that the material
had been stacked some time and had sunk
and that rigid measurements were not
made. The former explanation is
of course ridiculous when the excesses
[illegible] varied (as detailed above)
from 38 to 40 per cent. The latter
explanation is probably the key to
the situation and the probable frauds
for years past are appalling to think
of. On the 2nd day the overseer was
present at the measurement of the
on the 17th & 18th miles. He then went
away though told that earthwork
was going to be measured. The maistry
was however present at the measur
of earthwork on the 20th mile. On the
following day when earthwork on 10th
& 13th miles was measured the overseer
was again absent but the maistry was
present.

9. That there was fraud on the part
of the overseer there can be no doubt
and he has no explanation. He

dismissed from service and it will remain to be considered whether further steps should be taken.

10. Against Mr Booth there is the alternative of fraud or complete neglect of work namely that he signed as having check measured when he did not check measure at all. There are other matters ~~-~~ to be considered against him which will be dealt with further on.

11 The total loss to the Board as found by the Dy Tahsildar's measurements is Rs 140-9-6 exclusive of the sand and this should be deducted from the Contractor's bills.

12. The sand, I consider, should not be paid for at all and for this there should be a further deduction. The matter will be laid before the Board for formal orders.

Mr. Scott will be called on when he returns to explain his check measurements including that of

the sand in which he found an excess of 6 units or more than 12½ per cent and also why he passed all these bills for final payment though one (earthwork) was recommended for part payment only and further how he came to pass this sand though it was not brought from the river so that a gross fraud was being perpetrated.

× × × ×

(Signed) S. H. Wynne
President

(True copy)

(Sd) P. J. Pope
Asst. Collector
for
President

Copy applied for 7-5-94
Recd 24-5-94

(True extract)

C. [illegible]
Late L.-F. Overseer

VI C

C

To

**The President and Members of the District Board,**
*Nellore.*

*The humble appeal petition of C. Chenchu Ramayya, Late L. F. Overseer, Nellore Taluk presented under authority of Para 72 Rules under Madras Local Boards Act V of 1884 Chapter IX.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,

That your petitioner entered the service of Government in the Public Works Department in the year 1866 and continued in the service as a Clerk and Accountant until January 1880.

2 That your petitioner having procured an appointment as an Overseer in the L. F. P. W. Department left the D. P. W., took up the Overseer's Post in the same month and continued in the same capacity up to 24th April 1894, when he was dismissed from service by S. H. Wynne Esquire, the Ag. Collector and President, District Board, Nellore (vide Order Ref. No. 703 D. B. dated 25th April 1894, copy annexed marked A sent to your petitioner registered and which reached him on 1st May 1894.)

3. Your petitioner then applied to the President, District Board, Nellore, for a copy of his Proceedings No. 444 of 24th April 1894, (vide application copy and marked B) but in reply the President has issued orders on 8th May 1894, as N Endorsement on the original application that copy of the Proceedings will be given on payment of necessary fees which reached your petitioner on the 11th May 1894. Thereupon your petitioner remitted the necessary fees on the 12th May 1894, through Money Order and the copy of the Proceedings was given on 24th May 1894, (Copy enclosed as C.)

4. That the charges brought forward against your petitioner and which the Acting Collector and President holds proved may be summarised as follows :—

(1) That when the Contractor carted sand of an inferior quality not from the river Pennar a distance of 4 to 4½ miles but from the Gandavaram Channel a distance of 1 to 1½ mile in connection with the special repairs of the 17th and 18th miles of the Dornal Road I Section; your petitioner was careless or indifferent in the discharge of his duties.

(2) That when the materials collected and measured by your petitioner were again measured by the Deputy Tahsildar of Nellore, it was found that there was considerable difference between your petitioner's and the Deputy Tahsildar's measurements and that the difference was always in favour of the Contractor and against the Board and the only inference that could be drawn was fraud.

(3) That similarly your petitioner is found fault with the vast differences between the measurements of your petitioner and those of the Deputy Tahsildar in the earth work pits and here also the only inference that could be drawn was fraud.

As for the 1st charge your petitioner begs to submit that he was unable to find out the site whence the sand was carted for the following reasons :—

(1) That the General quarry for carting sand to the road in question being no other place than the river Pennar.

(2) That no complaints were made to your petitioner about any other sand quarry than the river.

(3) That the quality of the sand though differing in colour in some of the heaps having been found in no way inferior to be spread over the road.

(4) That the river sand when mixed with the blown red dust of the road cannot be possibly distinguished from the sand taken from any other place.

For the above four reasons the petitioner could not have imagined that this Contractor who is a respectable man and who had taken contracts for several years would commit any fraud.

Besides the above reasons your petitioner further begs to represent that from the kyphiats given by the following bandymen before the Deputy Tahsildar (1) Ghuntala Narigadu of Padamatypallem (2) Rottala Nagadu of Siddipuram, it may be seen that the Gandavaram Channel bank was filled with prickly-pear which they have removed and took the sand from it and carted to the road. It is apparent from this that the work people have purposely selected a new place undergoing even the expense of removing the prickly-pear and thus it would prove that there was no clear sandy ground that can easily be taken for a quarry or any other place where it could be suspected that work people could take sand from. Had there been any such place there would have been no necessity to the work people to undergo the trouble and expense of removing prickly-pear.

The above facts will clearly show that there is no carelessness or indifference on the part of your petitioner in the proper discharge of his duties. There being thus no proper reason for charging the petitioner either with wilful carelessness, negligence or indifference the aggravated charge or form of fraud laid against him is not supported by any of the statements made by the bandymen before the Deputy Tahsildar to the effect that your petitioner has ordered the sand to be carted from the Gandavaram Channel or that he connived at it in conjunction with the Contractor or his Agent or of any of his workmen to commit fraud. Your petitioner could not be expected to remain day after day on a single work to see that the Contractor or his people are carting sand from a place other than the one referred to in the estimate,

*As for the 2nd charge:—*

(1) That as regards the difference that is said to exist between the measurements of materials made by your petitioner and those said to have been made by the Deputy Tahsildar of Nellore, your petitioner begs to submit that it is hard to set aside the measurements of your petitioner in favor of those taken by a person who, to say the least, had absolutely no professional knowledge whatever to enable him to take measurements accurately. That the materials were first measured by your petitioner and were placed in the hands of the Sub-Divisional Officer and the D. B Engineer who both check measured the same and found his measurements correct; and thus your petitioner is actually exonerated from further responsibility.

That in matter of measurements your petitioner is bound by the practice in force in the Department and the following extract from the standard specification in force, lays down the principles your petitioner should be guided in the measurement of materials.

The materials will be gauged with a chain 33⅓ ft. long and a gauge board and no measurements will be taken (with tape or rod); and if the heaps do not coincide with the specification the heaps will either be rejected or calculated as ¾, ½ and ¼ units of 100 Cubic ft. according to the approximate size of the heaps.

That your petitioner begs to point out that there is absolutely nothing in the above rule to facilitate fraud and this system of measurements is more in favor of the District Board than of the Contractor.

That your petitioner further begs to point out that in the Sub-Magistrate's report he states that the lengths of all the heaps tally but the breadths and heights vary. This may be due to the scattered state of the materials as well as the measurements taken with tape. As in one case when your petitioner was present with the Deputy Tahsildar at the time of measurement the 1st heap of sand, which the Deputy Tahsildar wanted to measure in its scattered state was remade up, and when measured he arrived at the correct measurement of the heap. In other cases it was not done so. Had this been done there would not have been

any material difference between the measurements taken by him and the measurements taken by your petitioner. Your petitioner now ventures to assert that if the Deputy Tahsildar of Nellore be deputed to take measurements in the way in which he has done of the materials on all the roads in this District and which have been measured and check measured by other Overseers and check measuring officers, no doubt differences will be found to exist between the measurements of the Deputy Tahsildar and of those officers similar to what is alleged to exist between the said Deputy Tahsildar's and your petitioner's measurements. Thus showing that if your petitioner is guilty of any fraud at all it is such a fraud that the Local Fund Measuring and Check Measuring Officers in the District including D. B. Engineer are equally guilty of.

*3rd charge.*

As regards the difference between your petitioner's and the Deputy Tahsildar's measurements in earthwork pits your petitioner's measurements are correct in asmuch as the measurements seem not to have been taken by the Deputy Tahsildar with care and in a proper manner to which this vast difference said to have been found out may be attributable.

5. To render justice to your petitioner, your petitioner begs that the District Board may depute any Engineering Officer not below the rank of an Assistant Engineer to measure the works measured by the Deputy Tahsildar, it could be found out that there will be absolutely no difference between your petitioner's and that officer's measurements if only due allowance is made for shrinkage and other causes and for the circumstances that these measurements are made so long apart.

6. That your petitioner further points out that his absence with the Deputy Tahsildar is regarded as open to suspicion on his part.

7. On the 29th March at about 9½ P. M. your petitioner received a letter from the Deputy Tahsildar of Nellore to meet him on Dornal Road 4th mile, the next morning 5 A. M. Having been ordered by the District Board Engineer to present some urgent bills with necessary measurements next morning at his bungalow, Your petitioner wrote the same to the Deputy Tahsildar, adding that if the petitioner's presence is so necessary he will obtain the permission of the District Board Engineer and proceed, as the dates 30th and 31st of March were the last two days of the official year and your petitioner's presence will be absolutely necessary in the Engineer's Office to give the required information regarding the bills to be passed. Again on the evening of the 2nd April, your petitioner was sent for by the Sub-Magistrate and wanted to follow him to 17th and 18th miles of the Dornal Road. He accordingly went and when measuring the sand gave the information required by him but the Deputy Tahsildar who had got your petitioner's measurement books with him returned them and was going on taking his own measurements without checking the measurements in the measurement book and not giving an opportunity of even seeing the measurements he was noting down. Thus the petitioner was made to think that his presence was not absolutely needed by him. The petitioner was never told by the Deputy Tahsildar that the earthwork was going to be measured in 20th mile and that his presence is required as stated in the latter part of the 8th Para of the Proceedings No. 444 dated 24th April 1894, but on his return the Deputy Tahsildar came to the petitioner in the road at the Tarunivoyi Choultry and wanted to meet him in the 13th mile at 5 A. M. next morning. Your petitioner accordingly waited there until after 8 O'clock but seeing no sign of the Deputy Tahsildar's arrival and your petitioner having had to despatch some urgent returns proceeded to Nellore leaving behind him the Road Maistry and the necessary tools for measurement.

8. Had the petitioner any consciousness of his guilt, he would have gladly availed himself of the invitation made by the Deputy Tahsildar to take advantage of his professional ignorance and to hood-wink him by false representations. On the contrary, as he had a clear conscience he was confident that facts will speak in favor, and God will defend the right as he still hopes. He will.

9. Your petitioner further begs to point out that his unblemish service both in the D. P. W. as well as L. F. Department extending for a long period of 27 years and the perusal of copies of his testimonials, annexed marked as D, will themselves prove in what estimation your petitioner has been held by all those under whom he had served and your petitioner denies that he has done anything now to forfiet the good opinion that has been always entertained of him so that the Board will see that to throw out a person of your petitioner's description for no assignable reasons whatever is a matter deeply to be considered.

10. Your petitioner further regrets that the stringent rules of the Board of Revenue and Government quoted below regarding the dismissal of Public servants were overlooked by the President in dealing with the enquiry of your petitioner in his dismissal.

Board Standing Order No. 282 — Charges against Public servants.

"The Board impress upon all officers under their control the necessity of careful and close examination of charges brought against native public servants. If these servants are to be held strictly responsible for due exercise of the powers entrusted to them and if any abuse of these powers is to entail severe punishment, it is necessary that they should not be convicted on light or insufficient grounds. Care should be taken that they are not sacrified to mere clamour and that they are not caught by plots concocted to entrap them. It is indispensable that the investigation into the alleged offences should be conducted without haste and that every opportunity should be afforded to the accused of proving their innocense."

Resolution of the Most Honorable Governor-General-in-Council
forwarded with Mr. Under Secretary Couper's letter of the
24th February 1887.

* * * * * * * * *

"*Para 9.* In every case, the specific grounds upon which it is proposed to dismiss any servant, should be reduced to writing and furnished to him, and the answer or defence or explanation of the party taken in writing, and the final decision of the superior recorded in writing. It will not be absolutely necessary for every head of charge to be formally proved by evidence but where a specific fraudulent act is charged, of course, it should be proved in the presence of the party accused and subject to his cross-examination".

* * * * * * * * *

11. A procedure not adopted in this case to your petitioner's great misfortune.

12. In a case of this nature wherein the petitioner's past services for the space of 27 years and his future prospects are involved, the President instead of being biassed by the one-sided representations of the Deputy Tahsildar, would have done better, consistantly with the general sense of justice and in conformity with the Revenue Board Standing Orders and G. O. of Governor-General-in-Council, if he had been pleased to allow the petitioner to cross-examine the Deputy Tahsildar and the workpeople on the points reported against the petitioner. For, though this is a departmental question yet as the result of the investigation would affect the interests of the petitioner, the procedure that ought to have been adopted must be of the nature of a judicial enquiry in which the President should take a judicial notice of both the allegations of the petitioner and the report of the Deputy Tahsildar as between two parties who contend in a Court of Justice either for property, liberty, or other rights affecting their interests. The petitioner therefore most earnestly solicits the favorable consideration of the Honorable Board that he may be allowed the opportunity to show to the satisfaction of this Board that the report of the Deputy Tahsildar cannot be so much depended upon for its correctness without questioning his honesty, as the President has thought it fit to act upon it as an infalliable document that should be judicially noticed of without any scrutiny.

13. Under these circumstances the petitioner prays that the Honorable Board will be pleased to restore the petitioner to his former appointment with arrears of pay.

I beg to remain Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
C. CHENCHURAMIAH,
*Late L. F. Overseer, Nellore Taluk.*

*19th July 1894.*

---

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA
TWO ANNAS
TWO ANNAS

Proceedings of the District Board Nellore passed at a meeting held at 7-30 A.M. on Saturday on 28th July 1894 in the Collector's office. Nellore.

Members present

S. H Wynne Esquire President District Board
R. A Grahame Esquire Ag Sub Collector Nellore
Surgeon Capt Wright District Surgeon Nellore
C. H. D Marjoribanks Esquire Executive Engr
Nellore Division.
M. R. Ry B. S Rangiah Naidu Gry Deputy
Collector Nellore.
" C. Seshadri Row Puntulu garu Tahr
of Nellore.
" " A Raghava Row Puntulu garu
Tahsildar of Kandukur.
" " M. Seetharamiah Puntulu garu Dy
Tahsildar of Polur.
" " C Kristnaswami Pillai Avergal
Head master T. M. S. Nellore.
Mr. F. T Ward District Court-Vakil Nellore
M R. Ry. T. V. Venkatrama Iyer Avergal High
Court Vakil.
" K Visvanathayya garu.

(Page 1)

[illegible]

STAMP DEPARTMENT
AUG 1
1894
NELLORE

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA
TWO ANNAS

TWO ANNAS

THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON.

M. R. Ry. D. Morkondayya garu.
" . P. Venkatareddi garu.
" . D. Venkataramireddi garu.
" . B. Balakristnareddi garu.
" . K. Seetharamiah garu.
Ahamed Hussain Sahib

* * * * * *

* * * * * *

64. Read appeal petition C. Chenchuramiah late L. F. Overseer Nellore Taluk requesting to restore him to his former appointment

64. Resolved by a majority of nine to seven, the President & Mr Marjoribanks not voting that the appeal be rejected.

* * * * *

/Sd/ J. H. Wynne
Ag Collector.
& President

/True extract/.

Copied by: [illegible]
Copied.
28-8-94
Corrections none
Examined by C. H.
29-8-94

[illegible] Naidu
Dy Collector.
30/8/94

(Page 2)

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

AUG 1
1894

Copy applied for ........ 2-8-94
[illegible] ........ 31-8-94
True Copying [illegible]
[illegible]

1/4220/95

---

G 19th July 1894

From

C. Chinnaswamy
late Local Fund overseer, Nellore

To

S. H. Wynne Esquire
President Dist. Board, Nellore

Sir

I humbly request that your honor may be pleased to grant me the indulgence of engaging a pleader to appear on my behalf on the 28th Instant and to represent my case in support of the appeal herewith submitted, along with me.

I beg &c
C. Chinnaswamy
late L. F. ov.
Nellore Taluq

(True Copy)

C. C. S.

26/7/94 ~~94~~

**ORDER No.** 801/D. B.; **DATED,** 24th July 1894, Desp. 25-7-94
on petition dated 19th July 1894.

IV

*From* S. H. Wynne Esquire,

~~Vice~~-*President, District Board, Nellore.*

*To* ~~the~~ C. Chenchuramiah,

Late Local Fund Overseer

The petitioner's request cannot be granted as it is quite contrary to precedent and not in accordance with discipline

P. J. Pope
Assistant Collector
for
President

24-7-94

[D. B.; 11-7-91.]

I beg that you will be
so good as to furnish me with
copies of the following papers connected
with the enquiry of my appeal on your
Proceedings No $\frac{444}{24-4-94}$ before the meeting
of the District Board held on 28th July 1894
1 List of questions to be put to the Dy. Taha-
sildar presented by me to you in the meeting
& put by you to the Dy. Tahasildar.
2. Answers of the Dy. Tahasildar to those
questions.
3. Questions put to the Dy. Tahasildar by the
members of the D. Board
4. Answers of the Dy. Tahasildar to the
5. Suggest
of the Distr

From

C. Chinnaramiah
Late R. H. Overseer
Nellore Taluq

To

S. H. Wynne Esquire
President District Board
Nellore

Sir,

I beg that you will be so good as to furnish me with copies of the following papers connected with the enquiry of my appeal on your Proceedings No $\frac{444}{24-4-94}$ before the meeting of the District Board held on 28th July 1894

1 List of questions to be put to the Dy. Tahasildar presented by me to you in the meeting & put by you to the Dy. Tahasildar.
2. Answers of the Dy. Tahasildar to those questions.
3. Questions put to the Dy. Tahasildar by the members of the D. Board
4. Answers of the Dy. Tahasildar to the above questions
5. Suggestions made by different members of the District Board in the enquiry as [illegible]

Chinnaramiah

Necessary stamps will be given in the District Board branch.

18 August 1894

I beg to remain

C. Chenchuramaiah

late L.F. overseer

---

J

నెం. 1804/Eng dated 31st August 1894

Desp 1st September 1894

[illegible]

నెల్లూరు జిల్లా కలకటరు సి. డి. మెక్లీను [illegible]

దొరవారు.

2/9/94

[illegible] తాలూకా. [illegible] గ్రామంలోనుండు

[illegible] వ్రాసుకొన్న

1894 సం [illegible] నెల తే 18 దిగల మనివి అర్జీమీద

వుత్తరువు.

[illegible]

[illegible] Collector

To the Petitioner C. Chenchuramiah

Late L.F. overseer

Nellore

Copd [illegible]

Necess ufso will

the 8

~~IX~~

**ORDER**

On petition, dated

from

Village

taluk

SUBJECT.

---

~~VII~~ K

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA TWO ANNAS

THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON.

Questions to be put to the Deputy Tahsildar of accused by the late L. F. Overseer C. Chenchu Ramiah.

1 When did you send the letter to Overseer to meet you on Darwal Road 1st mile by 5 a.m.

— at 9-30 P.m. on the 29/3/94.

2 Did you send the letter direct or thro' the D. B. Engineer — ?

— Direct.

[Being the last 2 days of official year could not go without Engineer's permission]

3 Sending notice at 9-30 P. M 29th & asking to meet by 5 a m on the 30th Could this be called a Due notice ?

4 — While you are pondering on the 2nd mile 30th morning did you not talk over Oomapathy Mudaliar for a long time ?

5 How and in what manner did you take the measurements ?

— one Ramanujulu & a peon holding the tape Subbareddy clerk ~~[illegible]~~ noting down the measurements while the Dy Tahsildar seated in a bandy.

6. Did you not halt at Dommaramadugu from 10-30 a.m

(Page 2)

Necess ... well

VI

[illegible]

[illegible] 23

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

DEPARTMENT
AUG 4
1894
...LORE

---

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA

TWO ANNAS

THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON.

to about 3 P. M on the same day?

7 How many heaps of gravel did you find being carted at the time of your inspection where did you see them, is it in the center or in the side of the road.

8 When did you commence your measurements on 12 & 13 miles?

— at about 8 P. M before torch light.

9 Did you not decline to measure with chain & gauge Board presented to you by the Maistry?

10 Were you not seated on horse back while these measurements are ~~[illegible]~~ were being taken?

11 Will you produce the book in which measurements are noted on the spot?

12 Did you not take the advice of Overseer Ome=patty Modaly in framing your report at Nellore?

13 On your 2d trip on 3d April did not the Overseer got the 1st heap of Sand properly made up & measured. Is it not a full unit to the gauge board & chains?

14 Did you make up any heap of any other discription in this manner & measure.

15 Did you not return the Measurement Books to the overseer & took your own Measurements without Comparing the figures in the Measurement

(Page 2)

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

DEPARTMENT
AUG 4
1894

FOR COPIES ONLY
INDIA
TWO ANNAS
TWO ANNAS
THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON.

Book on the Spot?

16 Did you tell the overseer to follow you to 20th mile, if so, what was his reply?

17 On your return from Sangam did you not see the overseer in the evening on the road near Karuneyya Chaultry & told him to meet you in 13th mile next morning 8 A.M.

18 Did you go there in time or send any intimation to the waiting overseer?

19 When & where did you take depositions from Cartmen & before whom?

20 Did you not threaten the Cartmen when taking Kyfeats?

21 Have you not observed the scattered state of material in the heaps by the tread of Cattle?

22 Did you not, in your report say that the lengths of the unit heaps agree?

(True copy)

Copied by [illegible]
copyist

Corrections two only
Examined by C.
29-8-94

Treasury Dy Collector
30/8/94

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

DEPARTMENT
AUG 1
1884

---

L

Extract from the Service Register
of
C. Chenchuramiah

Sub Divisional Clerk on Rs. 25

Is well behaved, hardworking and intelligent.

(Sd) J. A. Fox Supervisor
6-2-73

Divisional Accountant on Rs. 30

He is well acquainted with the official routine and does his work satisfactorily.

10th October 1873 (Sd) C. B. Henderson
Lieut. R.E.

C. Chenchuramiah was Range accountant under me for 6 months during which time he acted to my entire satisfaction. He promises to be a first rate accountant.

26th September 1875 (Sd) E. W. Cotter
Lt. R.E.
Asst. Engineer

Though I have been but two months in charge of the Range, I have had opportunity to judge that Chenchuramiah is quite up

Necess [illegible] ell

to his work and promises well as an accountant. He is well conducted and intelligent.

East Coast Canal Range Officer 5th November 1875 } (Sd) S. Oltman Range Officer

I have had very good opportunities during the last 6 months I have been in charge of East Coast Canal Range of ascertaining Chenchuramiah's qualifications and capabilities for his post. He is quick intelligent and quite au fait with his duties and quite competent as an accountant. He is well conducted and respectable honest man.

29th January 1876 } (Sd) S. Oltman Sub Engineer

Chenchuramiah has been employed in the P. W. Department for 9 years & 3 months.

From his Service Register it can be seen that he has given

6th February 1895

satisfaction to all the officers under whom he has served.

He was Head Clerk of the East Coast Canal Range under my orders for 1 year & 10 months & I was well pleased with his diligence and capabilities.

31st January 1876 } (Sd) C. B. Henderson Lt. R. E. Asst. Engineer in ch. of Nellore District

Extract from the letter of Executive Officer to the District Engineer dated 1st August 1877

Chenchuramiah has worked very hard in the Range and on the whole has given satisfaction. Single handed he has managed the accounts and office work of the whole Division.

× ×

(Sd) J. H. Stephens Executive Officer

District Engineer's foot note on an application to the Collector

Chenchuramiah bears a high character for efficiency as accountant in the D. P. W., his personal conduct is reported good also and

Necess IV

I shall be sorry to loose his services but I will not stand in his way in his endeavour to better himself; if he gets the appointment he now seeks, I shall offer no objection to taking it.

5th August 1877 (Sd) J. O'Shaughnessy
District Engineer

Copy of a letter from the additional Sub Collector to the District Engineer 1st September 1877

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that I have this day appointed one C. Chenuramiah an accountant in your department to be superintendent of North Relief Camp, Nellore. I note that the man had your permission to apply for such an appointment. I shall esteem it a particular favour if you would be good enough to direct him to join forthwith.

I have &c

(Sd) C. S. Crole
Add. Sub. Collector

× × ×

Extract from the Examiner's letter in reply to the above

I regret to state that C. Chenchuramiah cannot be spared from his present duties.

29th September 1877 (Sd) A. G. Begbie
Captain R.E.
Examiner P. W. Accounts.

---

6th February 1895

Testimonials
L. F. D.

Ongole, 28th February 1883

C. Chenchuramiah has been an overseer under me in the Ongole Sub Division for about 2 years, during which time he has worked hard and carried out the work entrusted to him to my satisfaction. He is an honest and straight forward man and a good accountant. I wish him every success.

(Sd) H. Arbuthnot
L. F. Asst. Engr.

C. Chenchuramiah served under my orders as an overseer in Ongole Sub Division for nearly one year and four months, during which period he pleased me very much by his activity, energy and straightforwardness. He is very clever in arranging and managing his works. He has given me all possible satisfaction in the executio of the works entrusted to his charg He has always a faith and regard

Necess

in & for his superior Officers.

12th April 1885 }
Nellore }

S. Subramania Ayer
L. F. Sub Dt. Officer

---

6th February 1895

Local & Municipal D
CURRENT No.

To

His Excellency the
Governor in Council.
Fort St. George Madras

11. FEB. 1895

The humble memorial of C.
Chenchuramiah, late Local Fund
overseer, Nellore District

Most Respectfully showeth.

That your memorialist was in the service of the Local Fund Board at Nellore for a period of 14 years and was unfortunately dismissed on the 24th April 1894 for the following alleged charges brought against him by the President, District Board of Nellore, viz:

" 1. That he was careless and indiffer in carting sand to the 17th & 18th miles o Dornal Road.

2. That there was a fraud on hi

late Local

that he had believed simply what

stated to him by the Dy. Tahasildar.

3. That your memorialist thereupon presented an appeal to the District Board Nellore, explaining to their satisfaction that he had acted throughout the affair honestly and convinced them that there was no fraud on his part and showed clearly to the Board, that the difference of measurement was attributable to the Dy. Tahasildar's not taking measurements with the standard chain & gauge-board, and that the materials in question being scattered here and there and not heaped up together before they were measured by the Dy. Tahasildar, and to his taking measurements with the help of a torch-light, and as well as, that the measurements not taken in person by the Dy. Tahasildar but by a clerk deputed by him. The fact that, the lengths of all units of materials & that [illegible] the Dy.

Necess

that he had believed simply what was part on account of a difference found in the measurement of materials made by your memorialist and those of the Deputy Tahasildar.

3. That the same fraud was discovered in the measurement of earthwork executed by your memorialist on the measurement of the Deputy Tahasildar."

2. That with reference to these charges, your memorialist begs to state that he had explained to the President that the said measurements taken by the Dy. Tahasildar were not correct inasmuch as he had measured them with a tape instead of the standard gauge board & chain and that they were measured when the materials were scattered about. The President had neither seen them measured by a professional man nor was he himself present and checked the above meas ments [illegible] to check the [illegible] he was requested to [illegible] so at [illegible] late [illegible] that time and

Tahasildar in his report, is itself a proof that he has not taken the measurements carefully by reheaping the heaps properly.

4. That your memorialist was further charged with having carted sand from Gandavaram Channel a distance of 1½ miles instead of carting from the Pennair river as was agreed to by the Contractor. In connection with this your memorialist begs to explain that he was unaware that there was any sand in the Gandavaram Channel bank as it was fully covered with pricklypear but it appears that some of the cartmen having removed the pricklypear took some sand out of it secretly without his knowledge for which, he could not possibly account. All these things have been fully explained in his appeal petition to the District Board, which accordingly decided that your memorialist should be exonerated from all blame but to his utter misfortune the votes passed by the Board being only 7 in his favour against 9 two members, one the President, and the other a European member, did not vote either way.

5. From the foregoing circumstances it would clearly appear that the Collector wanted to

remove the existing system of working by the Local Fund Department altogether. For which purpose, he made your memorialist and 2 other European officers as the victims.

6. Your memorialist humbly begs to point out that if the system is wrong he could not be blamed for any or all the work executed by him under that system and consequently it was unreasonable on the part of the President to remove him altogether from the service, in which, he was a period of 14 years in this department and also 13 years in the D. P. W.

7. It may be observed here that your memorialist was not allowed any opportunity to cross-question the Dy. Tahasildar either through a vakeel or direct and the answers of the Dy. Tahasildar to the few questions put to him by the President were not recorded, if, on the contrary, they had been recorded, no doubt, your memorialist would be set free from all blame and charges and this he attributes more to his misfortune than anything else.

8. Your memorialist further regrets that the stringent rules of the Board of Revenue and the Government, regarding the dismissal of public

servants which clearly says, "that the specific grounds upon which it is proposed to dismiss any Servant should be reduced to writing and furnished to him, and the answer or defence or explanation of the party taken in writing, and the final decision of the superior recorded in writing", have been overlooked in this case.

9. Under these circumstances your memorialist humbly prays that His Excellency in Council may kindly consider each and every point pointed out in this memorial, as well as in the appeal petition to the District Board, and in the Proceedings of the Collector & President, and order his restoration.

For which act of kindness your memorialist, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

Your Memorialist begs to remain
Sir
Your Most Obt Servant
C. Chenchuramiah
Late Local Fund overs
Nellore

Your Memorialist humbly begs to submit the following records connected with the memorial for Your Excellencies kind perusal & return.

A. Memorialists letter to the President, asking him to cause some work under dispute measured in his presence.

B. Report of the Dy. Tahasildar with enclosures.

C. Dismissal order of the memorialist No 703/29.4.94

D. Proceedings of the President No 444/24.4.94

E. Memorialists appeal petition to the District Board

F. Proceedings of the District Board in reply.

G. Application of the memorialist to engage a Vakil

H. President's refusal order.

I. Application for public copies of the enquiry recorded before the meeting of Dist. Board.

J. Collectors ~~yadar~~ order that no record is kept.

K. Public Copy of questions proposed by the memorialist, put to the Dy-Tahasildar by the President

L. Copies of Testimonials obtained by the memorialist

late Local

n given for copying
n copied
n examined
n signed

189 .

AGAIN G.O., No. DATED
189 ,

ENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

FEES NOT FILLED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

*N.B.*—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.