

[L. & ...
9,000]

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 20482

DATED 2-11-96-

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition

Referring to the Sanitary Council
for report, the petition of Visvanatha
Meredati, Dy. Insp. of Vacc., Kaval
appealing ^{against} his reduction to the second
grade.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Petition from Viswanatha Mudali appealing against his reduction.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

*Again G.O. No. 6742 dated 7th April 1896 and
No. 15622 dated 28th August 1896
& Current No. 26562*

From *The Sanitary Commissioner, Madras.*

H.M.

FOR ORDERS.

In his Proceedings No. 1015 V. dated 18th June 1896 the Sanitary Commissioner passed an order suspending one Viswanatha Mudali, a Dy. Inspector of Vaccination for a period of 6 months and placing him at the bottom of the list of 2nd class Dy. Inspectors for neglect of duty and falsehood - Vide G.O. No. 1562 L., dated 28th August 1896. The present petition is an appeal against this order. The various charges framed against the Dy. Inspector and his explanations in respect of each of them are dealt with in para. 31 of the petition. It is the prayer of the Petitioner that, under the circumstances set forth in his petition, that he may be restored to his rank, pay and station with effect from the date of his suspension.

** Flag A.*

2. The chief points to which the Petitioner wishes to draw the attention of

Government

Government are the following:-

(1) That his service in the Vaccination Department extends over a period of 22 years.

(2) That he was transferred to Trichinopoly in July 1895 only about 6 months before Dr. Mallins, the late acting Inspector of Vaccination, visited the district.

(3) That owing to the remark of Government in G.O.No.1385 L.dated 26th July 1894 doubting the accuracy of the vaccination figures reported by the Dy. Inspectors of the Trichinopoly and Saturanges, the Inspector entered the District prepossessed with an idea that the vaccinators in Trichinopoly were capable of returning false figures and that it was a physical impossibility to verify so many as 80 cases a day on an average.

(4) That it was not impossible to verify 80 cases a day seeing that the District Medical and Sanitary Officer was able to verify so many as 179 cases in one day when he was on sanitary inspection duty and that such results could be attained by making proper arrangements and by the co-operation of the village headmen.

(5) That the Inspector was not able to verify more than 30 cases as he did not make any previous arrangement and as the day chosen for ^{his} inspection was a festival-Sivaratri.

(6) That the Inspector did not find any inaccuracies in the vaccination registers and village lists, but that the only faults found were the omission on the part

Flag B

Flag B

Flag B

Flag C

Flag C

Flag D

Flag E

Flag F

Flag G

part of the petitioner to put his initials opposite each name in the registers and lists and to classify the figures under "Primary" and "Re-Vaccination", the former omission being due to the instructions issued by the District Medical Officer not to disturb the work of Vaccinators, while the latter was due to an oversight.

(7) That there was no evidence as to the falsification of figures, as the Inspector did not send for any subjects in the villages visited by the Petitioner nor find any successful cases returned as unsuccessful or vice-versa, nor ^{was} any attempt made to take statements from respectable residents of the village and from the village officers that the petitioner had not visited the villages or verified the cases by actual inspection of the subjects.

(8) That the Sanitary Commissioner's remark, that, under rule 8 of Section II of the Vaccination Code, reference should have been made to the Inspector of Vaccination when the District Medical Officer's instructions interfered with the verification work, does not appear to be correct as the rule simply says that when any professional question regarding the practice or spread of Vaccination is referred to a Dy. Inspector for an expression of opinion, then the advice and orders of the Inspector should be sought; and that the petitioner would have been guilty of impertinence and disobedience to his im-

mediate

immediate superior if he had made such a reference.
(9) That the remark of the Sanitary Commissioner, that the Petitioner's statement that the registers were received by him only sometime before the Inspector visited the District and after repeated reminders and that before he could compare them with the nominal lists furnished to him and initial ^{them} he had to go out into camp with the Inspector was a deliberate falsehood, cannot be applied to him as the registers referred to were received before he joined the District in July 1895 and were not available on the dates on which he visited the villages as they had become mixed up with other old registers of 1893-94 in his predecessor's time.

3. From the District medical officer's letter to the President of the District Board of Trichinopoly, marked (a) by the petitioner, it will be seen that the District medical officer found fault with the petitioner only for carelessness & stated that he should be more careful in future. He says that he verified 179 cases in one day while on sanitary inspection duty & found no evidence of falsification of figures and reports that the Deputy Inspector bore a character for strictness and honesty. It does not appear that any weight was attached to this officer's words when the Sanitary Commissioner passed the order against the petitioner.

Moreover it will be observed that the present petition has been forwarded by him to Government without any remark. It is therefore submitted

yes
I go - But in such a case it wd be better if the C.S. obtained the further info which seems to him needed before sending the papers to me
BS
27/10/96

submitted that it should be referred back to him for report upon the ~~several~~ explanation given in it, as these appear to say the least of it, plausible. In fact, after perusal of the Sanitary Commissioner's proceedings and the petition from the Dy. Inspector the punishment meted out seems very excessive.

WSD
22.10.96

CS
order no 2048 Dated 2-11-96

The Petition of Nivaranadha Mudali will be referred back to the Sanitary Commissioner for report on the explanations given by the petitioner. The explanation offered appears to be plausible
A.L.H.
29/10/96

MA 30.10.96

To

The Sanitary Commissioner
with a petition
Supd Gupab

Refer
Please keep
papers together
27/10/96

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 2656 L

Order

From

*The Sanitary Commissions
for Madras.*

No. 1607
✓

Dated 24th September 1896.

Received 25 SEP 96

Registered 28/9

Enclosures 12

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

*Forwards petition of
Dr. Viswanatha Mudaly Deputy
Inspector of Vaccination Kavalali
Circle appealing against his
reduction to the second grade
etc.*

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

n given for copying
 n copied
 n examined
 n signed

ED AGAIN G.O., No.
 189

DATED

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

PRESENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO O. 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.