Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of clerk taking the paper or of attender.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

L. & M.
9,000-8-8-96.

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1028 M

DATED 18th June 1896

[**Despatch Abstract.**]

Establishment.

Agreeing with the Collector in considering that the explanation of the Manager of the Trichinopoly Municipal Office is not at all satisfactory, and awaiting the proposals for the revision of the office --- - promised by the Chairman in paragraph 5 of his letter.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA

TWO ANNAS

THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON.

not a new building -

3 - As to the 2nd point we are obliged to hold that the prosecution did not make out a case against the accused The burden of provin permission is no doubt lies on the accused He called upon the municipal Council to produce the ~~appal~~ (1) application he made for sanction to build in 1892 Though it is a fact that an application was put in in 1892, the Council did not produce it but they allege that the application paper along with other petitions have been sold away in the month of March or April 1894 Vide Manager's evidence. It is a matter of much regret that all these applications for sanction to build should have been destroyed within 2 years after they were presented though their preservation for more years is absolutely necessary to prevent encroachments upon Municipal grounds and also unnecessary prosecutions: we don't ~~see~~ (2) see that the sanction of the council for the sale of the records was ever obtained and the papers seem to have been sold away at the verbal orders (3) of the chairman. In this particular instance it i

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA TWO ANNAS

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA TWO ANNAS

Register of Summary Trials held by the Bench Magistrates of Trichinopoly Town during the month of September 1894.

Serial No	Date of the commission of the offence	Date of the report or complaint	Name of the complainant	Name, parentage and residence of the accused	Offence complained of or proved	Prisoner's plea	Finding and in case of a conviction a brief statement of the reasons therefor	Sentence	Date on which the proceedings terminated
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
S.C. 2255 T.C. 2660	22-1-94	6-7-94	N. J. Venkatachalam Iyer	Chellappa Chettiar Chinnakadai Street	Section 173, 263 and 180 Municipal Act	The accused pleads not guilty and states that he applied for permission of the council and as he did not get it after a month he proceeded on with the building. He further says that no permission is necessary as the building in question is in the back of his house. (Initialled) A. S.	Finding— 1—In this case the Municipal Council prosecute the accused for constructing a building without a license. The accused denies the charge and pleads 1st that no sanction was necessary as the building in question was constructed in the rear of his house and 2ndly that the sanction obtained by him in 1892 covers the present		

site also and no fresh sanction is needed

2—As to the first plea Bench are of opinion that to construct a building sanction f the Council is necessary whether the building is in the front abutting the road r in the rear. The definition of the word building includes a walls also. There is no oubt that the accused constructed 4 walls, terraced the portion of the house in estion and put up a window and it cannot for one moment be said that it is

10455
செல்லப்பசெட்டியார்
26-10-94 ஸ்ரீ

HUZUR TREASURY * TRICHINOPOLY
Sep 1? 1894

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

rather strange that the petition presented by the accused was not preserved though it is evident from the records that the case of the accused was pending before the Council in January 1894 Municipal Inspector who was in charge of the ward in 1892 was examined and his evidence on the whole goes to shew. that he understood that the accused had permission to build The endorsement sent to the accused, taken by itself means that the sanction given was for the same building The ward councillor who now applied for the prosecution of the accused says in his endorsement that the accused is building upon his old permission The conduct of the Municipal council in not prosecuting the accused tile now for building without sanction though they were in possession of the petition, presented by the accused also favors the conclusion that the accused had permission to build. All these circumstances added to the fact that the present building is only a continuation of the new building commenced in 1892 —

10456
வ. செல்லப்ப ஐயங்கார்
26-10-94 ரூ

HUZUR TREASURY TRICHINOPOLY
SEP 2
394

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

shifts the burden upon the prosecution to prove that the application made in 1892 by the accused was not for permission to build but only for storing materials. To prove this the council produced 2 registers containing the abstract of the petition presented by the accused. These abstracts are not admissable in evidence as they are not Secondary evidence of the petition itself Vide Section 63 of Evidence Act. Moreover Municipal clerk who enters the abstract in the book knows nothing about the petition without referring to the abstract. As it is, the abstract from the Municipal register does not definitely convey one meaning. If the word "and" is added before "for" it will certainly mean that the application was for permission to build also The register kept by the Inspector Exhibit I is useless as his evidence is against the entry therein. It is argued for the prosecution that the abstract does not state that a plan was submitted. Probably no plan was submitted at all as it is —

1-10- 14570

27-9-94

TREASURY

FOR COPIES ONLY
INDIA TWO ANNAS

generally believed that a plan is needed only when a new building is erected on a vacant site. It is also argued that the Sanction given was that of the Chairman and if the sanction sought for was for the construction of a new building the Sanction of the Council would have been obtained. It is quite probable that the clerk might have thought that the application was only for repairs as it was only to construct a portion of the old house preserving the other portion intact. That may be the reason for not placing the petition before the meeting. Anyhow the accused is not responsible for the omission or mistake of the clerk. It is very much to be regretted that the ward Councillor who had seen the spot before he sent the petition to the Council, as is usual, had not been examined. It is true that the breach of any Municipal law should be severely punished but in this case the prosecution is much weakened for want of the original petition which

10427

[illegible]

24/10/94

HUZUR TREASURY TRICHINOPOLY

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA

TWO ANNAS

alone can prove what the sanction was obtained for and which the council did not produce. We are not inclined to believe the evidence produced by the accused very much considering the doubtful nature of the case; we give the benefit of the doubt to the accused and order his acquittal under Section 245 C.P.C.

(Signed) K. Rengasami }
Hon: Magte 29-9-94. }

(Signed) A Savurimuthu
Town 2nd Class Magistrate
29-9-94.

(Signed) N. G. Gopalier
Honarary Magte.

(Signed) I. S. Samia Pillai
Honarary Magistrate

S(41) (29-9-94).

(True Copy)
By order
[illegible]
H. Clerk.

TOWN
MAGISTRATE

14567

[illegible]

27.9.94

[illegible]

[illegible] TREASURY · TRICHINOPOLY · SEP 12 [illegible]

7 sheets words 1113
Corrections & Interlineations } Four (4) ~~Three (3)~~

Application No. 441 for copy received	on	26-10-94
Stamp Papers called for	"	26-10-94
Stamp Papers produced	"	26-10-94
Copy ready	"	29.10.94
Copy delivered	"	30.10.94

Copied by M. Subramanyan
Compared by

By order

C. Clerk

TOWN SUB-MAGISTRATE TRICHINOPOLY

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA · TWO ANNAS

THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON.

S.C. 2255
S.C. 2660

15-9-94. Defence Witnesses

Def: 1st witness Mr. S. T. Rengasami aiyar sworn

I have been Chairman for 5 years. I don't know whether petitions are permanent records. A good lot of papers mostly petitions were sold away, probably in March last. I did not give order in writing neither the manager asked me permission in writing as to the nature of papers. No list of papers to be sold away was prepared. Sale proceeds of the papers was credited on 12-6-94. The papers were sold just about March 1894. I have an office order book. I mean memorandum book containing some of my orders. Exhibit IV is (~~[illegible]~~ (4)) in the manager's writing & bears my signature with the endorsement of the Cash keeper.

By Court. Exhibit II does not give power to erect a building. The endorsement by itself may or may not give such permission.

Voluntary statement by the accused.

New house petitions have to be sanctioned by the Council & the orders of the Council are communicated to the parties with the

14517

8410

[illegible]

10-9-94

HUZUR TREASURY ✻ TRICHINOPOLY
JUL [illegible] 94

FOR COPIES ONLY

FOR COPIES ONLY

INDIA
TWO ANNAS

the Criminal Procedure by the Town Bench Magte, Trichinopoly

Prisoner's plea	Finding, & in case of conviction, a brief statement of the reasons therefor	Sentence	Date on which the Proceedings terminated.

18-8-94 Nuisance Inspector Kasavalu Naidu Sworn
I was Inspector in charge of the 5.A ward for
2 years. Since 3 months I have been transferred
from that Ward. Accused erected a building in 1894
some 4 or 5 months back. I don't know the month
d and new building. It was formerly a tiled
cted. This building is a terraced one. New
built a new building to the north of the present
ddle building & not for the one already erected
none for the 2nd.

X finds a place in my register Exhibit I. I produce
middle building (~~is the~~ It is) is the continuation of the
norary Magistrates. X The deposition of the witness continued in 4 page.
n according to law. I am a clerk in the Trichy
for a space of 7 or 8 years. I used to register all
sometimes the following day. I see in Exhibit A
tions put in by the accused. The abstract shows
als alone and not for building. The accused
has.

14527

8158

[illegible]

1/9/94

HUZUR TREASURY * TRICHINOPOLY
JLY 16 1894

FOR COPIES ONLY
TWO ANNAS
INDIA

Register of Cases tried under Chapter XXIII of Code of

Serial No	Date of the commission of the offence	Date of the report or complaint	Name of Complainant	Name, parentage and residence of the accused	offence complained of or proved
S.C. 2255 S.C. 2660	22-1-94 11 ~~6-7-94~~	6-7-94	N. T. Venkata Chellam Iyr	Chellappa Chetty Chinnakadai street.	Section 173, 263, & 180 Municipal Act.

This building was erected between the al
house; it was demolished & a new building was er
foundation was laid; the walls are new. Accused
building in 1892. I prosecute the accused for the sui
in 1892 He has obtained permission for the 1st and
X Examination by the accused – The petition I refer to
it now Ex. II is the endorsement by the Chairman. the
building of 1892. (Initialled) H. R; T.S.S. N.G.G.' D
1-9-94. Court 1st witness Venkatachalamier Swo
Mul: office. I have been petitions clerk all along
petitions received the very day they are received and
entry bearing No. 3151 – This is an abstract of the peti
that he applied for permission to deposit mater

14567

2 8707

4/8/94

HUZUR TREASURY
1894
TRICHINOPOLY

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

3rd

has not filed any plan. if he had done so I would have entered it in the Register. If any application for erecting a new building is made without a plan, we used to reject such petition. The date on which the petition in question was taken from the petition box is 9.9.92. The date of endorsement is 23.9.92. This original petition along with other petitions of 1892 have been sold away — X. Examination by the accused — We have got all the petitions of 1893. I am the custodian of the current petition that is petitions of current year. After entering the accused petition I had no necessity to look into it. I always take down the substance of the petition. I am no relation of the Municipal Manager —

Court 2nd witness. S. Soondaramier sworn according to law — The petitions of 1892 were sold away under the orders of the Chairman that is in Janry or Febry. For the selling away of the above records Chairman has not passed any written order. I am quite sure that petitions were sold away before any report was received against the accused. There is record in the office to shew the realizations of money ~~by~~ the sales of those petitions. The money was received a month or so after the sale. Petitions were

Ext

[illegible]

4/9/94

HUZUR TREASURY
JLY 1[illegible]
1894
TRICHINOPOLY

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

sold for 3 Rs. to one Samia Pillai in the Contract. No list of the petitions sold was prepared as they were mixed up with waste papers.

X Exn. by the accused – Samia Pillai is a Municipal Contractor – The Council knew nothing of the sale – I am not in good terms with the accused.

(Initialled) A. S.

✳ Deposition of Inspector Continued –

I did not see foundation being dug inside – Exhibit A. is the petition register book maintained in the Municipal office – I was Ward Inspector in 1892 – I did not object to the building of 1892 nor did I report about it as he had already got permission – I knew this only by the petition I don't remember whether there was any prayer to grant permission to erect building – I was under the impression that no permission was necessary for Constructing a building in the rear of the building – From the order passed on his petition I thought that he was also permitted to erect building. I have been Inspector for 8 years – Exhibit III is the report I made for prosecuting the accused –

Accused [illegible] was a Municipal Councillor in 1892 & still Continues to be.

[illegible]

4/9/94 [illegible]

HUZUR TREASURY
JUL 16
1894
TRICHINOPOLY

FOR COPIES ONLY

TWO ANNAS

INDIA

THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON.

5.

Pro: 2nd witness Madurdanayagam Pillai sworn
I have been ward peon in V A. ward. The middle building is a new one. I saw when foundation was dug on 4 sides. The accused threw the earth excavated on the road; this was some 5 or 6 months ago. The middle building was built on a vacant site. He has put up a window in the west of the aforesaid building

No X Examination. Prosecution closes.

The accused pleads not guilty & states that he applied for permission of the Council & as he did not get it, after a month he proceeded on with the building. He further says that no permission is necessary as the building in question is in the back of his house (initialled) A. S. Adjourned to for local inspection. (initialled) A. S. 21-7-94

1-9-94. The accused now says that he has applied for permission in 1892 to erect Pukkah building under Section 180. Mul. Act to the north of the old terraced building and that he waited for one month as required in the above section for which he got endorsement Exhibit II. He adds that the present building

2 6210
4

[illegible]

4/9/94

HUZUR TREASURY
JULY 16 1894
TRICHINOPOLY

FOR COPIES ONLY

TWO ANNAS

INDIA TWO ANNAS

6

is a continuous one of his old plan & design and that no application is necessary for the one in question, that there was an interval of a few months on account of his fathers illness. The present building in question has its foundation on the north which is an old one. The present building is not a separate one. The accused promises to put in a list of witnesses for his defence on Tuesday next. (Initialled) A. S. (I.S.S., N.G.) Honorary Magte.

(True copy)

(By order)

Chief Clerk

TOWN SUB MAGISTRATE OF TRICHINOPOLY

2/824

[illegible]

4/9/94

HUZUR TREASURY
JLY 16
1894
TRICHINOPOLY

6 & last sheet

~~Correct~~
No. of words: 1077
Corrections & Interlineation } ~~24~~ (Four)

Application 334 for copy received } on 4-9-94
Stamp Papers called for " 4-9-94
Stamp Papers produced " 4-9-94
Copy ready " 11-9-94
~~Copy delivered~~ " 11-9-94

Copied by, A. Subramanian
Compared by, [illegible]

(By order)
Chief Clerk

1/1599 Mo 96

86

R 1292

Municipal Office,
Trichinopoly
18th March 1896

MUNICIPAL OFFICE
19 MAR 96
TRICHINOPOLY

From

S. Sundaram Aiyar, B.A.
Manager, Municipal Office
Trichinopoly

19 MAR 96

[illegible] [illegible] report [illegible] [illegible] 19/3

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council
Local and Municipal Dept.
Fort St. George, Madras

Thro' The Chairman,
Municipal Council,
Trichinopoly

May it please Your Excellency,

I beg respectfully to submit for the favourable consideration of the Government the following, my humble explanation regarding the remarks of the Dy. Collector and Chairman about me, contained in his letter to Government No 12 dated 20th February 96.

7036
27-5-96

1. The Assistant Accountant-General and Inspector of Local Fund Accounts has stated on the authority of the Assistant Inspector who conducted the audit of the accounts of this municipality for 1894-95 that

gc 7036
27-4-96

i. The auditor was delayed 10 days beyond the time allotted for the audit.

ii. That the reasons for this were that the accounts continued in much the same unsatisfactory state as the last year and that this defectiveness of the accounts is due to want of proper supervision and control and a consequent absence of discipline and attention to business and orders.

2. Regarding the delay of ten days, I beg to state that the time allotted for the audit of the accounts of each municipality is 14 working days and to submit with great defference to the rules that this time has always been found insufficient in the case of this municipality,

whose receipts ordinarily amount to more than a lac, the extraordinary receipts and expenses in connection with the Water-Works for the last three years being left out of account. The examination of the accounts of this municipality for the last 5 years has always extended to a period of about four weeks on an average. Therefore I beg to submit that the charge of delay should not be laid to the office staff, but should be attributed to the really heavy work that has to be gone through by the Auditor.

3. With regard to the remark that the accounts continued in much the same unsatisfactory state, I beg to submit that during the latter part of the year under audit there was a change made in the office staff — the Accountant of two years' experience being posted to do the duties of the House tax Clerk, the House tax Clerk of 4 years experience made to do Correspondence

work and the Correspondence Clerk being entrusted with the duties of the Accountant. This arrangement cannot but impede me in making any improvements in the keeping of the accounts. There has also been additional work thrown on the office during the year by the extension of the Private Scavenging Service and the rapid progress of the Water-Works. All this additional work was done by the office in the year without any additional establishment.

4. During the time of audit, there was a change in the office of the Chairman. M.R.Ry S. T. Rungaswami Ayyar Avargal vacated his office of Chairman and the Revenue Divisional Officer Khan Bahadur Khadir Navaz Khan Sahib assumed charge.

5. My first duty at this time has always been to wait on the Chairman in the mornings with tapals and papers and consequently I could not always give my attention to the office. During the time of audit, the office hours were from 9 A.M to 8 P.M.; I could attend the office only at 11 or 12 o'clock. The Asst. Inspector gave me permission to do so. He now and again told me that a few clerks came to office late on some days and these were at once reported by me to the Chairman and were fined. I also warned all the subordinates to render readily and willingly all the help required by the Assistant Inspector. I beg to submit that the charge of "want of proper supervision and control" cannot be laid against me personally, as the manager in this office is given no powers over the subordinates. I have no power to inflict any punishment whatever; I should only report the servants to the Chairman for any misconduct or neglect.

6. The Chairman says in his reply that the difficulty of rectifying

the accounts is "enhanced by the fact of the manager having caused the destruction of some of the records of the year previous to 1893". I beg permission to assure Government that no records were ever destroyed by me and that all the records relating to the account branch are preserved with great care.

In December 1893, the Office was removed from the Cantonment to the present building in the town. With the permission of the Chairman, I took this opportunity to sort all the old records and these were carefully arranged in almirahs. Other useless records — such as diaries of Sanitary Inspectors, periodical returns of a routine nature, obsolete forms and waste papers — were heaped up in one corner of the Office. After some time, these were sold away by order of the Chairman and the sale proceeds duly credited in the Cash-book. Since the time, there have been two audits of our accounts and the Assistant Inspectors had no occasion to report the destruction of any records.

7. The Dy. Collector-Chairman is of opinion that I am personally and entirely responsible for all the faults and omissions of all the servants of the Council who are mostly ill paid and possess no educational qualifications whatever. He has not been pleased to give me credit for the vast improvements which I have shown year after year in the keeping of the accounts in spite of the daily increasing work in all the branches.

8. I beg permission to quote below a few extracts from the audit-notes of the previous years for the information and favourable consideration of the Government.

Mr. A. H. Anthony, the then Assistant Accountant-General and Inspector of Local Fund Accounts, who inspected the accounts for 1891-92 has been pleased to remark that "I am glad however to be able to add that there has been a distinct improvement in the keeping of the accounts since the last audit. The present manager has evidently been taking pains to get the accounts right and if he continues to persevere will, I am sure, be able to show much greater improvement at the next audit."

M.R.Ry A. Govindan Avargal, the Asst Inspector, in his notes for 1892-93 has remarked that "the audit work on the whole may be said to be satisfactory. The manager, S. Sundaram Aiyar, is intelligent and painstaking."

M.R.Ry Toke Venkatapati Nayadu Garu, Assistant Inspector, who audited the accounts of this municipality for 1893-94 has stated that "S. Sundaram Aiyar B.A. continued to be manager. He appeared to be intelligent and conversant with the details of his work. With greater supervision over the work of his subordinates and closer attention to instructions issued from time to time, I am inclined to think that he

could show better results."

I beg to add that I have put in a good service of five years in this municipality and I have all along worked to the entire satisfaction of the Municipal Council and of its Chairmen — M.R.Ry S.T. Rungaswami Aiyar Avl and Khan Bahadur Khadir Navaz Khan Sahib under whom I have had the honor of serving for a much longer period than under M.R.Ry P.S. Singaravelu Pillai Avargal who assumed charge of this municipality so late as the 14th December 1895 only. Respectfully requesting Your Excellency's mercy and kindness,

Beg to remain,

May it please Your Excellency,

Your Excellency's most humble
and obedient servant

S. Sundaram Aiyar B.A.

Municipal Manager

From

S. Sundaram Aiyar
Municipal Manager,
Trichinopoly

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council
Local & Municipal Dept.
Fort St George, Madras

Thro' the Chairman M.C.

Dated 18th
Despd 18th } March 1896.
Recd

Subject.

Submitting explanation regarding the remarks of the Chairman about me.

556
1252
28-3-96

Returned to the Petitioner. As punishment having been inflicted, he has no right of appeal

S Singaravelu 27/3
Chairman

27/3/96

1599

No. 26

MUNICIPAL COUNCILLORS' OFFICE,
TRICHINOPOLY 15th May 1896.

FROM, M.R.Ry. P. S. Singaravelu Pillai Avergal
CHAIRMAN,
Municipal Council,
TRICHINOPOLY.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 1599 M.

TO,
The Chief Secretary to Government,
Local and Municipal Department,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

Through the Dr. Collector of Trichinopoly.

SIR,

With reference to para. 1 of G.O. No 703 M. Mis dated 27th ultimo, I have the honor to report that the petition submitted by the Manager is not so much an explanation as a protest against remarks on his management recorded by the Council at a Meeting, and based on the notes of the Assistant Inspector of Local Fund accounts. As under G O No. 1654 M dated 6th October 1891 appeals to Government are admissible only when "servants whose appointment requires the sanction of Government are "fined, suspended or dismissed" and as no such punishment had been inflicted on the Manager, I held that there were no grounds for an appeal. I thought it would be subversive of discipline if every representation made by a ministerial officer were to be forwarded merely because it was addressed to the Government, and therefore returned it with the following endorsement.

"Returned to the petitioner. No punishment having been inflicted, he has no right of appeal".

I now submit the petition in original.

2. As regards the statements in the petition, I have merely to state that any opinion formed by me of the Manager's capacity was based on the voluminous notes of Mr Brito and on the state in which I found* matters in the office. My subsequent experience of the past three months has led to a slight modification of it. I now consider the Manager a fairly intelligent man and capable of making a good manager under proper control. The conditions under which he worked all along, appear to have developed laziness and indifference to details. I observe a disposition in him to work hard and make himself useful.

* & also, it may be added, on an experience of about 2 months as Chairman, prior to submission of his letter dt. 20 Feby 1886
Sd.

3. As regards para 3 of the G.O. I beg to state that the rule now is to entrust a bill collector with only one book at a time. But it is found to retard the collection somewhat, as he has to refuse taking the taxes of individuals who may offer to pay, but whose bills are not in the book at hand.

4. With reference to the destruction of records referred to in para 3 of the Collector's endorsement, I beg to state that the Manager denies, in the first part of para 6 of his petition, that any "records were ever destroyed". But in the second part of it he admits that some records "were sold away". In the absence of a list of records so "sold away" it is difficult to say whether they did not

include any records worth preserving. However, he asserts that it was done under the sanction* of the Chairman, but there is no written record of it. Nevertheless there can be no possible doubt that the Chairman was aware of it, from the fact that the sale proceeds are credited under his initials. I submit herewith certified copies of judgment and depositions in S.C. No 2255 of 1894 on the file of the Bench Magistrate of Trichinopoly and in the course of which depositions were given by the Manager and the late Chairman M.R.Ry S.T. Rungaswami Aiyer. The copies were furnished by a Municipal Councillor.

5. In view of the fact that the Bill to amend the District Municipalities Act is expected to be passed at an early date when other and somewhat radical changes in the Constitution of the office are to come into effect, I have thought it best to wait till then to submit my proposals for revising the office establishment.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed[ien]t ser[van]t
15/5
Chairman

Ent

* If what the Manager says is true, viz. that he obtained the sanction of the late Chairman (it has not been asked if it is true), his conduct in having papers destroyed without a list made out & sanctioned in writing, was most reprehensible.

When other and radical changes in the consti-tution of the office are to come into effect I have thought it best to ... proposals for ... the office establishment.

Current No. 1128 / 96

Local & Municipal Dept.

1599/M

From, ~~M.R.Ry~~
~~P.S. Sivaswami Pillaiaval~~

CHAIRMAN
Municipal Council,
TRICHINOPOLY.

COLLECTOR AND MAGISTRATE
23 MAY 96
TRICHINOPOLY

To, C.S.
The Chief Secretary to
Government,
Local and Municipal
Department,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

Through the Dy Collector
of Trichinopoly

Dated 18 May 96
Despatched 18 May 189 .
Received 4 JUN 96

No. 26

ENCLOSURE. S. Two.

SUBJECT.

Submitting the report called for in G.O. No 703 M-Mis dated 27.4.96 on the matter of the petition presented by Municipal Manager S. Sundaram Aiyer.

Endt. No. 1128/Rev. 96 dt 21/5/96

Submitted

18 5 96 Dy Colr

Endt. No. 15/3 Rev. of 96
Enclos: 3
Dated 1/6/96.

Submitted,
& I have made a few comments in the margin. I cannot

NS

regard the manager's explanation as at all satisfactory, especially in the face of Inst. Vr's report, but in view of the radical changes in contemplation, to which the Chairman refers in the last part of his letter, matters may as well remain as they are for the present as the Chairman appears to think this the best course.

Collector

Camp – Kodalyapatti.
29.5.96

C.S.
misc.

Order No. 1028 M mis dt 18-6-96

The Government agrees with the Collector in considering that the Manager's explanation is not at all satis-factory. The proposals for the revision of the office establishment promised by the Chairman in paragraph 5 of his letter will be awaited.

V.R.
9/6/96

W.W.S.
11.6.96

16-6-96

P & O.

To The Chairman, M.C. Trichinopoly
thro' the Collector.

Despd. 19/6/96

8/6.

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

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