V. Rajagopal

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.
(ஆராய்ச்சிக் கூடம்)

ஆவணங்களுக்கான கோரிக்கை.

ஏட்டின் விவரம்.

தொகுதி எண். அ.ஆ.வ.ந. எண்.	ஏட்டின் எண்.	துறை.
G.O. 370 (P) 7 March 1895 Municipal		

தேதி : 17-11-88

V. Rajagopal
கையொப்பம்.

குறி பு.—(1) ஒரே கோரிக்கையில் ஒன்றுக்கு மேற் பட்ட துறைகளோடு தொடர்புள்ள ஆவணங்களைச் சேர்க்கக்கூடாது.

(2) கோரிக்கை இரட்டைப்படிகளாக எழுதப்படவேண்டும்.

Archives 3(a)—85,006—16-8-77.

L. & M.
9,009-3-4-96.

Local & Munl. (1895) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 372 M.

DATED 7th March 1895

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition.

Informing **P.K.** Chathoo, late Hospital Assistant, Chali Dispensary, Tellicherry, that the Government of India declines to interfere with the discretion exercised by the Local Government in with-holding his petition.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Rd 478/31.

To,

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of India,
Calcutta.

Sir,

With reference to Government of India's order No. 540 Home Department, dated Simla, the 6th September 1894, I beg most respectfully to bring to your notice that in accordance therewith, I submitted the memorial to the Government of Madras, but they declined to forward it on the ground that the Chairman's order of dismissal in the case is final.

I humbly beg leave to point out that the Municipal Chairman, Tellicherry dismissed me under compulsion of Government of Madras and expressly against his Conscience and Conviction of duty as may, at a glance, be seen from his letters Nos. 311 and 967 (Vide enclosures 4 & 9) and from the local Govts orders dated

dated 6th April 1891 (Enclosure #2) and 17th January 1891 (Enclosure E).

In these circumstances I have no alternative save to resubmit my memorial to the Government of India directly and pray fervently that you will be so gracious as to place the same before his excellency the Governor-General in Council for his favourable Consideration.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obdt & humble Servant.
V. N. Chathoo

Pondicherry,
8th January 1895.

Late Hospital assistant,
Chali dispensary.

To,

HIS EXCELLENCY

The Governor-General in Council,

FORT WILLIAM,
CALCUTTA.

Respectfully sheweth,

That memorialist most humbly begs to appeal against the order of the Madras Government No. 50 M dated 6th April 1891 (Enclosure A 2) peremptorily insisting upon the Municipal Chairman, Tellicherry, in spite of his avowed reluctance to agree thereto, (Enclosure L) to dismiss memorialist from the post of Hospital Assistant in charge of Chali Dispensary in the Municipality.

2. Hopeful that his clear case wanted only an exposition to prove his innocence and to persuade the Local Government to reverse their hasty judgment based upon quite a one-sided evidence, he memorialised them on 2nd January 1892 (Enclosure A. 1.). But Government, to his utter disappointment and grief, dismissed the appeal, with a formal endorsement declining to interfere, without even deigning to give memorialist the satisfaction of their reasons for such refusal (Enclosure M.).

3. The firmness of his innocence prompted him to lay the appeal a second time before His Excellency the Governor, this time through his Private Secretary. But memorialist was silenced with an order that no notice will be taken of similar petitions in future (Enclosure N). He is thus obliged to lay his hard case before Your Lordship.

4. The grounds of his appeal are so clearly set forth in his memorial to the Local Government (Enclosure A. 1.) that he considers it superfluous to recapitulate them here. A patient perusal of that memorial, he humbly ventures to believe, will give Your Lordship an idea of the imaginary nature of the charges preferred against him by his enemies, and conclusively show that he is a sorry victim to a most pitiless and astute conspiracy that his pretty extensive practice and consequent affluent position called into existence.

5. Memorialist most humbly begs to submit that it is extremely painful that his whole future prospects should be blasted by his having been the cause, so unintentionally on his own part, of exciting envy in others. He respectfully prays Your Excellency in Council may be graciously pleased to take his hard case into favourable consideration, and to order his reinstatement with arrears of pay, to the post from which he has been so unjustly dismissed, for which act of kindness and charity, he shall, as in duty bound,

Ever Pray.
P. K. CHATHOO,
Late Hospital Assistant, in charge
of Chali Dispensary, Tellicherry.

P K Chathoo

TELLICHERRY,
8th January July 1892

P. S.

Memorialist begs leave to add that on the occasion of His Excellency the Governor's visit to this town on 19th October 1893, he had taken advantage of the opportunity to present his original memorial, (Enclose A1) again, in the hope that his importunity at least might induce a reconsideration of his unhappy case. He long expected a reply to it, but has been sadly disappointed. He begs respectfully to urge that this has been the cause of the unusually long delay in the submission of his present memorial and prays earnestly that it may be overlooked.

P. K. C.

P. K. C

4,000—13-8-04.

Local and Municipal Department.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper :—

From P. K. Chathoo. late Hospital assistant in charge of Chali Dispensary, Tellicherry, praying to forward the accompanying memorial to H. E. the Governor-General in council, soliciting to order his reinstatement with arrears of pay to his post from which he has been so unjustly dismissed.

Order. 3d November 1894 No. 1620 M. Mis.

Under rule No. 2 of the rules in G. O. dated 6th October 1891 No. 1654 M. which have the force of law the Chairman's Order of dismissal in this case is final. The appeal now preferred thus falls under clause (8) section III of the Memorial rules printed in G. O. dated 18th November 1889 No. 931 Public, and is accordingly withheld under the

the discretion vested in Government by that rule.

(True Extract)

Lionel Davidson
3/14

ag. Asst. Secretary,
for Chief Secretary.

PKC

To

The Petitioner.

3/
655- Instr 95

Encl

A, 1.

To

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

Respectfully Sheweth,

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

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

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

I. Professional inefficiency.

4. The charges under this head, though very serious if true, are fortunately for Memorialist, built upon too flimsy a foundation to stand scrutiny in the light of collateral evidence. The only ground upon which this hasty judgment of inefficiency was pronounced by the two acting Civil Surgeons and confirmed by the Surgeon-General, is that Memorialist prescribed Strychnia in a case of Encephalites, variously described by all these three officials. Mr. Lafranais vaguely describes it as "one patient suffering from Encephalites", Letter to the Chairman No. 139 dated 23rd June 1890 para III. (Vide Enclosure B.). Mr. Cooper on the other hand, saw it distinctly figure as case No. 350; while in the Surgeon General's office it had mysteriously shifted to the position of case No. 101 Letter No. $\frac{C}{11}$ dated 26th September 1890 para 2 (enclosure C) but strangely enough, in spite of these three different positions assigned to it, Encephalites stands in the Nominal Register as case No. 100.

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

6. As to the case itself and the prescription laid to Memoralist's account, he begs to submit most respectfully that to say *Encephalites* in case No. 350 has been spuriously altered into *Eczema*, is just the reverse of fact, the truth being that the word has been so tampered with as to make believe that it is the altered form of an original *Encephalites*, as would amply appear from the following facts.

7. Mr. Lafranais himself says, in his letter No. 139 dated 23rd June 1890 para III (Enclosure B) "*one* patient is entered as suffering from Encephalites &c", and it is therefore clearly impossible that there could have been *two* such cases within the date of the said letter. For, the words used are expressly "*One patient*" and not "*A patient*, and it cannot be presumed for a moment that a man of Mr. Lafranais' position and attainments is not familiar with the distinction obtaining between these two simple words. This '*one patient*' could be no other than No. 100, as the genuineness of the entries in that case has never been doubted. It was under this supposition that your Memorialist submitted his explanation to the Chairman upon the above letter, and the Chairman passed the remarks quoted by Mr. Lafranais in his letter to the Surgeon General. Letter No. 308 dated 8th December 1890 (Enclosure D). If therefore the genuineness of No. 100 is admitted, as it has all along been, it is impossible there could have been a second case of Encephalites under No. 350, as asserted by Mr. Lafranais upon the strength of a small 'slip of paper' left by Mr. Cooper as the sole record of his condemnation of your Memorialist's efficiency, upon which so much correspondence has already passed. It would thus appear there was no necessity whatever so far, for the Memorialist to have tampered with the entries in No. 350; moreover, it is quite improbable that he would have resorted to the foolish and tell-tale method of erasing the word *Encephalites* and writing over it the word *Eczema*, when it was open to him without any fear of detection, to have changed the page altogether out of the stitched Nominal Register, as Mr.Cooper had not taken the precaution of affixing any distinctive mark, either to the entry or any where else on the page, to render such a step by any means difficult or dangerous. It therefore follows that the only reasonable alternative is that this transparent interpolation must have been the work of Memorialist's enemies in the hospital, when the books were so informally detained there by Mr. Cooper, and subsequent to Memorialist's explanation to the Chairman upon the said gentleman's report, charging him with having prescribed Strychnia in a case of Encephalites. That explanation, awakening them most painfully to the groundless nature of their charge, inasmuch as no Strychnia could be found on the said prescription, their disappointed expectations would not allow them to admit the error, but prompted them to attempt to substantiate it by hook or by crook. Hence, they seemed to have searched for a case where Strychnia was actually prescribed, and having alighted on No. 350 which answered their purpose, it is plainly evident they altered *Eczema* in the Nominal Register so as to give it the appearance of having been written over a partially erased *Encephalites*. In connection with this, your Memorialist would humbly point out a significant fact for the kind consideration of your Excellency in Council. The prescription No. 350 is identical with those in other cases of Eczema treated by him, for instance, Numbers 26, 36, 65, 99, 101, 218, 228, and 350, while in the real case of Encephalites (Case No. 100) Strychnia is altogether absent. It does not therefore stand to reason that a man who could correctly prescribe for a disease in one case should be suddenly seized with a strange forgetfulness when an exactly similar case is presented to him a few days later. As to the absence of external remedy in No.

350, so emphasised by Mr. Lafranais in his attempt to show that it could not have been Eczema as it first stood (Enclosure D), Memorialist begs leave to shew that Zinc ointment was exhausted that day the (10th,) but the remedy was prescribed to the same patient on the 12th, 14th, 16th and 18th. This fact must clearly show any unbiassed examiner of the Prescription Book that case No. 350 could never have been Encephalites, as not even the veriest novice in medical science would have prescribed Zinc ointment to be applied externally in such a case.

8. This would furnish an additional proof of the very careless and prejudiced manner in which his books have been examined by those to whom Government was pleased to refer them for opinion and report .

9. It has been further urged by Messrs Cooper and Lafranais that the actual case of Encephalites No.100 had altogether escaped their notice and that their remarks and report referred solely to case 350. But this plausible excuse, Your Memorialist ventures to submit, carries its own condemnation and an easy collocation of incontrovertible facts would at once lay bare the futility of the attempt on the part of the above Officers to enolve an altogether fictitious charge against your innocent Memorialist. For, the *red ink mark* made by Mr. Cooper is still in the Nominal Register against case 100 under date the 23rd May, bearing witness as plainly as possible that the case *did* come under his special notice and that it was the one selected for report; coupled with this there is another circumstance that entirely negatives the position taken by the said officers with regard to case No. 100; for in the remarks column of the 28th of May, only five days after case No. 100, there are Mr. Cooper's initials, making it extremely improbable that he had merely turned over the few pages before it without casting his eyes on that which contained case No. 100. The fact is that those who were at first so sanguine about securing your Memorialist's downfall upon the strength of the errors which they hastily supposed case No. 100 contained, found themselves in a very uncomfortable position when closer examination proved their mistake; and the subsequent shifting of charge from 100 to 350, the tampering with entries in the latter No. as well as the additional charge of falsification of Registers preferred against Memorialist to make good their altered position, are nothing more than the attempt of a drowning man to catch at a straw.

10. The whole charge of inefficiency turns upon this one point, viz *prescription of Strychnia in a case of Encephalites*; and must accordingly stand or fall with it. Your Memorialist ventures to hope that the above facts and explanation would thoroughly convince your Excellency in Council that Strychnia has *not* been prescribed by him in the only case of Encephalites ever treated by him (No. 100) and that the shifting of the charge from No. 100 to No. 350, after it was found that the former could not stand, and the latter so tampered with as to be capable of being used against your Memorialist, shows plainly a good deal of animus on the part of the Civil Surgeon and a good deal of scheming on the part of his subordinates in the hospital. It only remains for your Memorialist to lay bare the motive for such a spiteful conspiracy and to hint at the persons who might have thus joined together to effect his ruin and disgrace.

11. Mr. Cooper was at first very friendly with Memorialist, but one day some notices were sent him with directions to have the widest publicity given to them. Those notices invited patients suffering from cataracts of the eye to submit them-

selves to operations at the hands of Mr. Cooper. To please his superior officer he did his best to persuade people of the efficacy of Mr. Cooper's mode of treatment; and a few days later when he was in the hospital, two such patients turned up; but as Rs. 15 were demanded from each of them, one withdrew at once and the other promised to return the next day with the fee, but though he kept his promise as far as his returning was concerned, he failed in the latter and more important part of it, to the chagrin of Mr. Cooper, who was made to believe, by some one of his subordinates who had a grudge against Memorialist (as will be explained later on,) that the patient in question must have been dissuaded by Memorialist with a view to secure him for himself. A second cause was soon added to this, for Mr. Cooper hearing that your Memorialist had a tolerably fair practice at Thiruvangad, the most aristocratic portion of Tellicherry, thought he must be making an immense amount of money and was anxious to have a share in it; with this view, he asked Memorialist to introduce him to some of the wealthy families there and secure for him some '*good cases*', but Memorialist could not satisfy him in this second demand also; and lastly, it so happened that some of the patients who had been continuously attending the Tellicherry hospital for a considerable time without deriving any apparent benefit from Mr. Cooper's treatment, were fortunately, to your Memorialist's credit, soon discharged cured from the Branch hospital.

12. As to the subordinates above alluded to, Memorialist has strongest reasons to believe that it could have been no other than P. Kanaran, hospital assistant, and Raman, Compounder, who are partners in the Chemist's shop of Tellicherry. The former came to Memorialist before he was appointed at Chali, with proposals of starting a Chemist's shop at Tellicherry and invited him to take up shares in the concern, but as Memorialist had some thoughts of starting one himself, he did not respond to the request. A second time the same man came to him with a different request, to direct his prescriptions to the Chemist's shop started as at first proposed; but as he had already established dealings with the older one of Messrs. Macdonald & Co, he was unable to satisfiy him even in this. A third and last request was made to him when he took charge of Chali, to the same effect, but Memorialist had to give him the same discouraging reply. He departed, vowing revenge, and as events have proved, he has put his threat into effect.

II. Falsification of records.

13. Memorialist has thus strong reasons to suspect that the alteration and tamperings with the entries in No. 350, as also the letter "S" entered against it under dates the 25th, 27th, 29th and 31st May 1890, and in the cases mentioned in paras 4 and 5 of the Surgeon General's letter No. $\frac{C}{11}$ dated 26th September, 1890, (enclosure C) are solely due to his ingenuity and malice. For, it is a curious fact that these latter entries are almost the only cases where "S" appears to be put down in the Nominal Register, and look as if they have been specially created to contradict the prescription book and supply an item of accusation against your Memorialist. Your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to note that out of a total of one thousand four hundred and sixty cases treated by Memorialist and entered in the Nominal Register, not more than ten cases are marked with "S" and that too, quite different from Memorialist's ordinary hand-writing, as is notably the case in No. 157; and curiously enough these objectionable "S"s are conspicuous by their absence both before case No. 100 and after No. 350, and it will also be graciously taken into consideration that these books were at first taken away from the Chali hospital during the absence of the Memorialist, were detained in the Tellicherry Dispensary for ten days; and that subsequently, when these were submitted for the Civil Surgeon's inspection monthly, he was in the habit of detaining them in the Tellicherry Dispensary for 7, 8, or 10 days together on each occasion. During all this period, it does not at all appear from the records that they have been in the exclusive and proper custody of the Civil Surgeon who may be above such mean devices, but were probably left in charge of the hospital staff, or at least were accessible to them, as is plain from Mr. Lafranais' letter to the Surgeon General, No. 308 dated 8th December (Enclosure D) wherein he says, "The Prescription Book and Nominal Register were not only examined by me but also by Mr. Cooper and the *two Hospital Assistants and the Clerk of the Hospital*, and each and every one of us saw distinctly "Encephalites" in the Nominal Register." Apart from the very questionable authority of *the two Hospital Assistants and the Clerk of the Hospital* to examine the books of your Memorialist, he begs most respectfully to point out that the above words betray a state of things in the Tellicherry Dispensary which renders it easy for the Hospital Assistants or the Clerk to do whatever they like with the records, if only adequate motives were present, and this motive your Memorialist submits, will be seen to be amply present, in this case, when it is remembered that the Hospital Assistant, Mr. P. Kanaran, a native of Tellicherry, and who has been somehow or other kept in his native place for years together and the compounder of the Hospital, are partners in the Chemists' shop of Tellicherry, and had been so cruelly disappointed by Memorialist's refusal to patronize their shop even after repeated requests.

14. As to corrections in cases Nos. 331, 343, and 382 from "swelling of testicles" and "Cough" into 'Orchitis,' 'Bronchial catarrh' and "Bronchitis" respectively, your humble Memorialist begs leave to submit that this charge against him may be taken as an example of the competence of malice and ill-will to distort the most innocent act into a ground for complaint and accusation. He admits these corrections, but at the same time craves for permission to state that had he omitted to do so, perhaps the very same omission would have been turned against him and cited as an example of insubordination and stubborn persistence in errors, even after they had been pointed out and criticised by superior officers. He was the Hospital Assistant, Compounder and Clerk all in one, and in the consequent hurry and press of work, he might be reasonably excused if he had not kept to the strict scientific nomenclature in one or two cases. Besides, these corrections are made in such a straight-forward way as to preclude the possibility of any ulterior motive on the part of the Memorialist—the original entries are simply crossed and the corrections entered above them, without the slightest semblance of any attempt to conceal the alterations.

15. As his case depends entirely upon an unbiassed, but sympathetic examination of his books, Memorialist most respectfully prays Your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased *to examine his Nominal register and the Prescription book*, when he ventures to believe his innocence will be satisfactorily established.

III. Insubordination.

16. Without entering at length into the details of charges under this head, Your Excellency's humble Memorialist begs to be allowed to state that even Government admits para 3 G. O. No. 58 M. Miscellaneous date 17th January 1891 (Enclosure

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Even granting for the moment that he was really in error in the diagnosis and prescription of case No. 340, it will be remembered that this is the one solitary instance out of no less than 1,500 cases where the conjoined scrutiny and care of the two Civil Surgeons, and the Surgeon General have succeeded in showing him at fault. He humbly leaves it to Your Excellency in Council to decide if the solitary instance is sufficient to overweigh the testimony to the contrary afforded by his University Diploma and the certificates of efficiency as to his past services. The charges of insubordination and unsatisfactory antecedents have been sufficiently refuted above ; it is needless to repeat them here. He begs respectfully to conclude this memorial with the fervent and humble prayer that your Excellency in Council will be most graciously pleased to cancel the above G. O. and order his reinstatement to the office from which he has been so cruelly ousted, for which act of kindness and British Justice he shall, as in duty bound,

EVER PRAY,

P. K. CHATHU,
Late Hospital Assistant in charge of Chali Dispensary.
TELLICHERRY.

P. S.

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

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

P. K. CHATHU.

P K Chathoo

4
655 Mis 95

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following paper.

From the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tellicherry dated 14th February 1891 No. 967 trusting that the Government and the Surgeon-General would be satisfied if the Hospital Assistant Chathan is suspended for 2 months and not to be so very severe as to dismiss him.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras dated 18th March 1891 No. 228.

In returning the letter referred to me for remarks under your endorsement No. 147 dated the 11th March 1891, I have the honour to state that the charges against Hospital Assistant Chathan Menon of the Chali Branch Dispensary are by no means so trifling as assumed by the Chairman Municipal Council Tellicherry. He has been found guilty of falsifying Hospital books, of being insubordinate and insolent to the Acting Civil Surgeon, as well as neglectful of his duties and under these circumstances I regret I cannot advise Government to alter its decision in his case.

(ENCLOSURE ~~A~~ A. 2.

Order dated 6th April 1891 *No.* 50 *M. Mis.*

The Government agrees with the Surgeon-General in considering that nothing short of immediate dismissal from Municipal employment can be admitted as a sufficient punishment for the misbehaviour of the Hosptal Assistant referred to. Should he not be dismissed, the amount provided in the budget for payment of his salary will be struck out of the budget. The Chairman will report, without delay, what action he proposes to take in this matter.

(Signed) O. V. BADELY, MAJOR. R. E.
Under Secretary, P. W. D.
for chief Secretary.

(True copy)
A. GOVINDAN,
Chairman.

ENCLOSURE B.

No. 139. CIVIL DISPENSARY TELLICHERRY.
23*rd June* 1890.

FROM
The Ag. Civil Surgeon,
Tellicherry.
To
The Chairman,
Municipal Council,
Tellicherry.

SIR,

In taking over charge of the Civil Dispensary and the station of Tellicherry, your letter No. 187 of the 19th instant was brought to my notice by Mr. Cooper. In it you seem to doubt that I, as Civil Surgeon, have any authority over the Branch Dispensary at Chali. I have the honor to inform you that prior to this there has been a Branch Dispensary here (Tiruvangad) which was placed under the control of the Civil Surgeon without any question being raised. As the name branch signifies, it is dependant on the Main Dispensary, and being responsible for the working of the Main Dispensary it follows that I must have supervision over the Branch.

2. I am responsible to the Surgeon-General for the correct submission of all returns, and I fail to see how a correct monthly return can be made from the books of the Branch Dispensary when they are kept in the way they are done now. I cannot see under what head

ing in the nomenclature of diseases the Hospital Assistant in charge of the Branch Dispensary intends bringing in the so-called disease *Cough* as it is merely one symptom of a large class of diseases.

3. I do not think it was necessary that Mr. Cooper should have waited till he was called upon to express his views as to the capacity of the Hospital Assistant in charge at present. The errors he has committed are too glaring to be passed over lightly and as the supervising officer he has simply done his duty in bringing to your notice the doings of the Hospital Assistant. In his register one patient is entered as suffering from Encephalites which signifies inflammation of the Brain and its membranes. This is the most serious disease that can attack a man, but strangely that patient appeared in person at the Branch Dispensary and was treated, therapeutically in, an extraordinary way. On the same day he got two mixtures, one containing the Bromide and Iodide of Potassium and the other Strychnine, Sulphate of Iron, Nitro Muriatic acid and Quinine. I can assure you that such treatment will not emanate from a competent man, for the mixtures, instead of relieving the patient will simply bring him to his grave. The lives of the patients seeking such a practitioner's advice and aid are the least to say in a very critical condition.

4. The books were returned by Mr. Cooper yesterday to the Hospital Assistant at Chali, which he has not only refused to take charge of, but has written a letter without any heading alluding to some imaginary memo. I therefore forward them to you.

5. In conclusion I have the honor to inform you that the day I took charge, I went over to Chali with Mr. Cooper, and although it was 20 minutes to 4 P. M. I found the Dispensary closed and no one to tell me where the Hospital Assistant was to be found. I particularly wished to go round Chali carefully, along with the Hospital Assistant, as he has already treated a case of "Choleraic Diarrhœa" there, to take the necessary precautions to prevent as far as possible the occurence of the fell disease, in its usual hot bed, Chali, but my visit was quite useless owing to the absence of the Medical Subordinate.

6. I shall deem it a favour if you will ascertain and inform me at your earliest convenience the views of the Council on the subject of my supervision and the extent of my control over the Branch Dispensary.

I have &c.

(Signed) C. A. LAFRENAIS, L. M. S.

Ag. Civil Surgeon.

(True copy)

A. GOVINDAN,

Chairman.

ENCLOSURE C.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following letters.

From the Collector of Malabar, dated 2nd August, 1890, No. 359, submitting for consideration correspondence in original relating to the attitude assumed by the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tellicherry, towards the Civil Surgeon, Tellicherry etc.

From the Surgeon General with the Government of Madras, Fort St. George, dated 26th September, 1890, No. $\frac{C}{11}$.

With reference to your memo No. 673 L. and M. dated 2nd September, 1890. I have the honor to state for the information of Government, that after a careful examination of the books of the Chali-Branch Dispensary which were received in this office on the 22nd Instant I find the following discrepancies.

2. In the nominal Register opposite No. 101, a case is entered as "Encephalites," and in the prescription book this is shown to be treated with Sulphate of iron. As the patient attended the hospital for sometime a grave error of diagnosis must have occurred.

3. This patient is further entered as having attended the hospital on the 25th, 27th 29th and 31st May 1890. The prescription book contradicts this entry as regards the 29th, and on the 31st the hospital is declared to be closed and no prescriptions entered. This points to a very serious falsification on the part of the hospital Assistant.

4. Another case, No. 129 is also entered as attended on the 31st May.

5. A third case, No. 157 is entered as attended on the 30th and 31st May, both these, the prescription book fails to confirm.

6. Case No. 298 was entered as stated by the Civil Surgeon as "Cough," but was subsequently changed to Bronchitis when the error was exposed.

7. These errors and falsifications are very serious and would require severe departmental notice, but as the hospital Assistant has shewn himself insolent to his superior officers, negligent in attending hospital as pointed out by the Civil Surgeon and disobedient to orders, under these circumstances, I feel compelled to adhere to my former decision, and recommend his dismissal.

From the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tellicherry, dated 23rd September, 1890, No 533, stating that the Hospital Assistant, Chathen, was appointed by the Chairman to do duty at Chali Dispensary and furnishing information as to his qualifications and services.

ENCLOSURE D.

From the Assistant Surgeon, C. A. Lafrenais, Ag. Civil Surgeon, Tellicherry, to the Secy to the Surgeon-General. with the Government of Madras dated, 8th December, 1890, No. 308.

With reference to your docket No. $\frac{C}{106}$ dated the 6th Instant and received this day. I have the honor to submit that the books of the Branch Dispensary, Chali, were examined on the 15th June, 1890, by Civil Apothecary W. J. Cooper, who was then Acting Civil Surgeon here.

His notes taken at the Branch Dispensary on a slip of paper and initialled by him are herewith forwarded for your information.

From these notes it is to be seen that the case of Encephalites referred to in my letter No. 139 of 23rd June 1890, was No. 350, in the nominal Register of the Branch Dispensary.

On referring now to the nominal Register I find that Encephalites has been erased and changed into Eczema, but the treatment in the Prescription book is identical with that reported by me except that Mag. Sulphas has been added to the 2nd prescription and which contains Liquor Strychniæ.

The alteration is evident and even a partially successful attempt has been made to erase the mark made with red ink by Mr. Cooper in the margin of the Nominal Register opposite No. 350.

I beg also to invite your attention to other corrections, made in the Nominal Register, those diseases which stood as "Cough" Nos. 343, and 382 have been altered into Bronchial Catarrh and Bronchitis and No. 331 which stood as swelling of testicles has been changed into Orchitis.

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

I beg to state further that the Prescription book and Nominal Register were examined for the month of June 1890 and No. 100 which was treated in May, was not seen by me at all. The Prescription book and Nominal Register were not only examined by me, but also by Mr. Cooper and the two Hospital Assistants and the clerk of this Hospital and each and every one of us saw distinctly Encephalites in the Nominal Register.

In addition to this, along with my letter No. 139 of the 23rd June, these books were sent to the Chairman. Municipal Council, Tellicherry, who has himself had some Medical Training, and is a private practitioner here. Had I committed such a serious error he would surely have been the first to detect and point it out to me instead of which in his answer letter No. 211 of the 26th June last, he says, "none of us are infallble. Is the diagnosis of even the best of Medical men always correct? Is their treatment always befitting, and what is Mr. Chathan in

comparison" Which is clearly an acknowledgement of the error committed by Hospital Assistant, Chathan, and pointed out by me. The erasures and corrections must have been done by the Hospital Assistant sometime subsequent to the letter No. 211 of the Chairman's.

The books as directed are herewith returned per book post.

From the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, Fort. St. George, dated 10th December, 1890, No. 832.

With reference to your Memorandum No. 949 dated the 14th November 1890, I have the honor to report that from enquiries made by this office, Chathu Menon does not appear to have ever been employed in Government service. It will however be seen from the enclosed copy of a letter from the President, Municipal Commission, Madras, that this man held the appointment of Assistant Deputy Inspector of Vaccination under the Madras Municipality from May 1884 to April 1885, during which time he is said to have been constantly reported for gross neglect of duty and insubordination and was eventually discharged for having pecuniary transactions with a subordinate.

2. As regards para 2 of the G. O., I have the honor to state that Strychnine was not prescribed in the case referred to in my letter, No. $\frac{C}{11}$ of 26th September last, but it will be seen from the enclosed copy of an explanation received from Assistant Surgeon Lafrenais that it was prescribed in another case No. 350 in the Nominal Register, and I have satisfied myself after inspection of both the Nominal Register and the Prescription book that the Statements of Mr. Lafrenais are quite correct. I may state, as desired by Government, that the prescription of Strychnine is an important error in the treatment of Encephalites.

(ENCLOSURE E)

Order dated, 17th January 1891 *No.* 58 *M. Mis.*

The Surgeon-General's letters read above will be communicated to the Chairman, Municipal Council, Tellicherry, with the remark that the Government is fully of opinion that Hospital Assistant, Chathan ought to be dismissed from Municipal service. The Government trusts that after a perusal of these papers and on a consideration of the further information regarding Chathan's antecedents now available, the Chairman will see his way to doing this without further delay. The action taken on the point above referred to, should be reported to Government within one month after receipt of these Proceedings.

2. The Government regrets to observe that the Chairman is unable to see the very discourteous and improper tone of his letter.

3. His Excellency the Governor in Council considers that at present the position of Civil Surgeons in relation to Municipal Hospitals and Dispensaries is by no means as clearly defined as it should be. In order to remove all doubts in the matter, the Surgeon-General will be requested to submit as early as possible a draft of rules under Section 25, Act IV of 1884 for the approval of Government.

(Signed) U. S. BRODIE,
Ag. Assistant Secretary.

(True Copy)
A. GOVINDAN,
Chairman.

ENCLOSURE F.
COPY OF THE CERTIFICATE,
FROM DR. STUART DAVIS.

MUNICIPALITY OF MADRAS
Health Department,
Municipal Office,
21*st May* 1885.

P. K. Chathu Menon entered the Municipal service as Assistant Dy. Inspector of Vaccination on the 26th May 1884, and served till 26th April 1885. During which time he gave fair satisfaction; professionally I have no fault to find with him, but he was not at all fitted for

inspection work and his services were dispensed with because he got a subordinate to go security for him to borrow some money.

I have, otherwise no fault to find with him and I am sure as an Hospital Assistant he will give every satisfaction.

He writes a good hand and knows English well.

(Signed) R. E. STUART DAVIS, B. A. M. B. B. CH.
SURG. M. D.
Health Officer
Madras Municipal Council.

DR. GOVINDAN, LATE CHAIRMAN'S
CERTIFICATE.

G

Mr. P. K. Chathu, Hospital Assistant, was in charge of the Chalil Dispensary for about one year. He was very kind to his patients and worked with an enthusiastic spirit. The Government of Madras wanted him to be dismissed from the Municipal service although he did not deserve such severe punishment. He is a very sorry victim to professional jealousy.

(Signed) A. GOVINDAN,
Late Chairman.

No. 533.

H.

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
Tellicherry 23-9-90.

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

SIR,

With reference to memo. No. 674 dated 2nd September 1890, I have the honor to state that the books of the Chal Dispensary were duly despatched to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras as directed, on the 18th instant.

2. When the Branch Dispensary at Chal was to be opened this year under the sanction of Government, the Surgeon-General was duly applied to for the services of an Hospital Assistant and the District Medical Sanitary officer communicated that one, M. I. Philip, Hospital Assistant, has been posted to do duty at Chal when required by the Municipality.

3. Upon this that officer was informed that his services would be required by 1st May 1890. On the 2nd May he replied that owing to the paucity of hands and non arrival of relieving subordinate he could not send up Mr. Philip at present.

4. In the meantime P. K. Chathen, a duly qualified 3rd Class Hospital Assistant, as per Diploma dated 22nd June 1884, had applied to the Surgeon-General for the post and the following reply was received to this office on his petition :—Memo No. 2591. The appointment referred to, has been filled up by the District Surgeon in communication with the Chairman. It is left to the Municipality to employ whom they like.

(By order)
F. REEVES, SURGEON,
Ag. Secy. Surgeon-General,
with the Government of Madras
1st May 1890.

5. As the District Surgeon was unable to spare a hand and as the concluding portion of the above memo left the appointment at the disposal of the Municipality, Chathen was accordingly appointed and the fact communicated to that officer.

6. On his receiving his Diploma, Chathen was in the same year (1884) appointed Deputy Inspector of Compulsory Vaccination and posted to Government Centeral Depot, Chindrapet, where he did duty for 9 months and came to his native place on a month's leave, but having overstayed it owing to family affairs he had to forfeit his appointment.

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

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

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

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

(True copy)

No. 967.

9

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
Tellicherry 14-2-91.

To

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

SIR,

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

Hoping that this would meet with the approval of Government.

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

(True copy)

10*th September*, 1891.
TELLICHERRY.

(ENCLOSURE 6) J

TO

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

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

SHEWETH,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

28/9/91.

(ENCLOSURE ~~H.~~) K.

To

MR. P. K. CHATHU
LATE HOSPITAL ASST. CHAAL,
Tellicherry.

DEAR SIR,

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

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

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

We are dear Sir,
Yours ever gratefully,
(Signed) 1. K. KUNHI KORAN.
(Signed) 2. K. KANNAN.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

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

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

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

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

To

The Petitioners.

FKL

5/165 no 895

No. 311 L. MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
TELLICHERRY 26th JULY 1890.

To,

THE COLLECTOR OF MALABAR,
CALICUT.

SIR,

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

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

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

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

5. The enclosures are herewith returned.

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

(True Copy.)
(Signed.) T. K. RAMUNNI,
Chairman.

M.

To The Petitioner,

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

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

Government Order dispensing with his service may be cancelled Order 18th January 1882 No. 122 M. Mis. The Govt. declines to re-consider the orders passed in the Petitioner's case.

True Extract.

(Signed.) N. S. BRODIE,
Acting under Secretary,

Local and Municipal.

N.

Proceedings of the Madras Government.

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

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

True Extract.

(Signed.) LEWIS,
Under Secretary,
for
Chief Secretary.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 655 M

No. 65

UNDER SECRETARY
24 FEB 95
PUBLIC & LEGL DEPTS.

From

H. Luson, Esq.,

Under Secretary to the Government of India.

To

The Chief Secretary to the Government of Madras

Calcutta, the 19 February 1895.

Home Department.

(Medical), Sir,

I am directed to forward a petition from P. K. Chathoo, dated 8th January 1895, in which he appeals against the orders of the Government of Madras withholding his petition addressed to the Government of India in connection with his dismissal from the post of Hospital Assistant in charge of the Chali Dispensary under the Municipality at Tellicherry; and I am to request that, with the permission of His Excellency the Governor in Council, the petitioner may be informed that the Governor General in Council declines to interfere with the discretion exercised by the Government of Madras in withholding the petition.

2. The enclosures of his petition are returned herewith.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

H. Luson

Under Secretary to the Government of India.

655 M of 95

[9] LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

Local & Municipal Dept
PR. CURRENT No. 655 M

From

The Under Secretary to the Govt. of India
Home Department
Medical

No. 65

Dated 19-2-95

Received 25-2-95

Enclosures 6

SUBJECT.

Forwarding petition from P. K. Chathoo appealing against the orders of the Govt. of Madras withholding his petition addressed to the Govt. of India in connection with his dismissal from the post of Hospital assistant in charge of the Chalii Dispensary under the Tellicherry municipality and requesting that the petitioner may be informed that the Governor General in Council declines to interfere with the discretion exercised by the Govt. of Madras in withholding the petition

/ with order /

N
nisi Order. 7-3-95-No 372

The Memorialist will accordingly be informed that the Government of India decline to interfere with the discretion exercised by the Local Government in withholding his petition.

V.R. 4/3/95 M 6/3/95

To, M.R.Ry P. K. Chathoo, B.A.
Tellicherry.
Dated 8/3/95

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

ENCLOSURES.

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

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

BACK PAPER, No. OF 189

FURTHER PAPER, No. OF 189

Copied by C.S. 7/3

Examined by S...d

INDEXED.

[7]

Miscellaneous.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPT.

G.O., DATED 7-3-95

No. 372/m

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition

Informing P. K. Chathoo, late Hospital asst. Chali dispensary under the Yellicherry Municipality that the Govt. of India declines to interfere with the discretion exercised by the Local Govt. in withholding his petition.

When given for copying ____
When copied ____
When examined ____
When signed ____
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.D., No. DATED
189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.								
STATEMENT WITH DITTO.								
PAPERS NOT FILED 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.