L & M.
9,0[illegible]-8-96.

Local & Munl. (1896) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 748 M.

DATED 4th May 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition.

Declining to interfere on behalf of K.C.Sivaramakrishna Aiyar late Overseer Madura Municipality in the matter of his request to be restord to his post.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

---

[7]

INDEXED.

14

Miscellaneous.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPT.

G.O., DATED 4 - 5 - 96,
No. 748 M.

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition

Declining to interfere on behalf of K. C. Swaramakrishna Aiyar, late Overseer, Madura Munlty. in the matter of his request to be restored to his post.

√

t has not
dep to the,
been dis
Govt. Cann
a ordin
chairma
to reappoi
can do
will be
forfeit to
g inter

G.O.	No.

G.O.	N

Read again Order of G ment, date
189 , No. , Miscel

Enclosures.

Current No.

Statement with ditto.

Order of Government

Statement with ditto.

Papers not filed up, being meant for des
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 M H C

Examined by S V

Lo Municipal Dept.
EN No. 352 M

DEPUTY COLLECTOR, MADURA DIVISION
3 - MAR. 96

CHIEF SECRETARY
29 JAN. 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GHT HALE

THE GERNO CONCIL,

Fai George.

The humble appeal of K. C. Samakrishna te verseer of the Mra Municip iding at Sivagu, as Ovande the Lessees, Sunga Zemi

Most Res tfully Sheweth,

1. That the Petitioner, whose sices as Maunipal Overseer were on the h March 1891 dispensed by the thema for no fault of the Petiti r, as will be seen from the papers incher submitted an appeal to the Municipal Council on the h June 189 in te prescribed time as per rul with the result that the ncil passed solion No. 186, dated the 23rd ne 1891, which ran as fols:—"As tllar has resigned the office, no a al can be entertained".

2. That, not having tendered an signation, titier submitted an appeal against this Resolution to your llency's Gent on the 18th March 1892, which was sent to the Chain for expla s o the circumstances under which the Council passe Resoluti 16, dated the 23rd June 1891.

3. That, the Chairman having sutted his repo his office No. 22, dated the 13th June 1892, in reply to the . as the staces, the Government passed an order, vide No. 1144, dal st Jy 189 gthat, "as it is clear from the papers read above that Over Sivrama Iyer was dismissed from Municipal service, his appeal tition ould tetained by the Municipal Council and disposed of on its ms."

4. That, on receipt of this G. Od after n ally long delay, Mr. M. Tillanayagam Pillai, the Chairman, aced the before the meeting of the 14th February 1893, when about membe sen; and, seeing

t has not
dep lette
been dis
Govt Cau
e
Chairman
to uppo
can do
will be
forfeit lette
g into

that a ¢ majoritve 17 mbers were for reinstating the Petitioner and spoke ›rably of id opy that the Petitioner was a good man and that he ll him ıy but it the dignity of the office must be kept up Upon th nd on hition, Council passed the following Resolution No. 542, dat the 14t ry 1:—"The Overseer has not been dismissed His resigion was d and nonth's pay was paid to him."

That t Resolm entirely acquits the Petitioner of all charges that t Chairm rough against him and gives a direct denial to the Governme's view No. 1, dated 1—7—92, that the Petitioner was dismissed.

6 That olutio le Petitioner presumes, has been duly communicated your Ey's Grament as it ought to have been.

7. That, een ared by such an enlightened body of the Council that he was nossed, Petitioner dropped the matter for the time being; but in 189 a arcy occurred in the Municipality, he applied and, hen t mar red him the appointment, vide order No. 381, dated 16——94, a itted nomination to your Excellency for orders of approval, a such a is u necessary as per rules in force, for all appointments arrying y o 50 and upwards, Your Excellency's Government declin to a ction nomination of the Petitioner on the ground that the Petioner's s were spensed with by a previous Chairman.

No. V.[illegible]
AC 731 —
9.6.94

8. That, tioner w found to his great surprise that the Council's Resolutn No. ted 1—93, has either been left uncommunicated to your Excellecy's Gent ough communicated, has not been considered by Governmnt whing or declining to accord sanction.

yes. This was
was not before
Govt.

9. That, face the Council's Resolution No. 542, dated 14th February 183, in v is deed by the Councillors inclusive of the Chairman Mr. M Tillam Pill that the Petitioner was not dismissed, the Petitioner was entit animiate restoration but for the fact that the Petitioner, who eld a ntender the Lessees of the Sivagunga Zemindary, and who carel only at dur was cast on him, did not press for such restoration.

[illegible] is said to have
[illegible]ged —

10. That by Government order declining to sanction his nomination, justice deni and in fact the Petitioner's prospects have been entirely blight

11. That the Petitioner is only 26 years old and his qualifications have been approved of by Government as will be seen from his medical certificate and G. O. No. 1027, dated 15th August 1889.

12. That the Petitioner still holds an appointment as Overseer under the Lessees of the Sivagunga Zemindary on Rs. 60 plus allowance and is in charge of Irrigation and Public Works.

13. That, in conclusion, the Petitioner most humbly and respectfully begs to request Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to reconsider the Petitioner's case, and restore him to his former appointment and to declare that he is not disentitled to reappointment in the Municipality.

The petn has not
according to the,
not been dis-
So the Govt cann
interfere on his be
If the Chairman
wishes to reappoint
him he can do so
but it will be [illegible]
vires, for not to
anything inter[illegible]

14. That, for this act of charity and benevolence, the Petitioner, shall as in duty bound, ever pray.

Petitioner begs to remain,

Your Excellency's Most Obedient and Humble Servant,

Sivagunga,
27—1—96.

K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer.

late Overseer of the Madura Municipality.

Enclos:- Previous Papers - 1.
Testimonials - 1.

Victoria Press, Madura.—17—6—1896.

TO

HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONORABLE
THE GOVERNOR-IN-COUNCIL,
FORT ST. GEORGE.

The humble petition of appeal of K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer, *late Overseer of the Madura Municipality, now residing at Kaliyarkoil as Overseer, Sivaganga Zemindary, Madura District,*

Most Respectfully Sheweth :—

1. That the Petitioner studied in the Engineer Subordinates' Class, College of Engineering, Madras, and left it after having undergone the course of training for 2½ years under the extended new system of education and was then appointed temporarily in 1889 in the Local Fund Engineering Department, Madura, on a salary of Rs. 50 per mensem where he acquitted himself satisfactorily and on being recommended by the superior officer of that Department he was taken as Overseer on probation for the Madura Municipality in June 1889 on a salary of Rs. 50 plus Rs. 12 (horse-allowance) per mensem.

2. That the then Chairman of the Municipality after being thoroughly satisfied with the Petitioner's work recommended to the Government that the Petitioner might be made permanent which was accordingly sanctioned (vide G. O, No. 1027M dated 15th August 1889).

3. That the Petitioner was always diligent in his work and discharged his multifarious duties as Municipal Overseer to the entire satisfaction of his superiors (vide copies of his testimonials herewith enclosed).

4. That the present Official Chairman, Mr. M. Thillanayagam Pillai, only a few days after he assumed charge of the Madura Municipality, casually remarked one day that the road work carried on in the Chitraikara Street ought not to have been let on contract and that it was greatly delayed and that the Petitioner should explain why it was so let on contract.

5. That, while the Petitioner was about to submit the explanation called

for, the Chairman issued the written Order (vide A) to the Petitioner for which the Petitioner submitted the explanation (vide B).

6. That the Chairman without in the least caring for the explanation summarily dispensed with the services of the Petitioner (vide C) alleging the following grounds :—

(*a*) There was no necessity to let the work on contract and it ought to have been done by the road coolies.

(*b*) A large establishment was maintained at a cost of Rs. 440 and very little was done by them during the last 15 months.

(*c*) Roads were not in good condition and those repaired in 1889 were not properly maintained.

(*d*) The Overseer and coolies did not do work for the last 12 months.

(*e*) When he (Mr. Tillanayagam Pillai) was in charge of the Municipality last time, Chockalingam Pillai (another Overseer) was asked to be in charge of the roads and Petitioner was utterly unequal to his work then and he is not a little better now and Petitioner's retention in service is a sheer waste of Municipal money.

7. That as regards the charge (*a*) the Petitioner begs respectfully to submit that there is one Chitraikara Street in ward No. IX of the Municipality for the repairs of which an estimate was submitted to the Council by the Petitioner's predecessor in office and was sanctioned to be let on contract by the Council. This Order sanctioning the contract and accepting the tender of one Srinivasa Naidoo was sent to the Petitioner for execution about the end of 1889. Accordingly and in obedience to the Chairman's Order, the work was entrusted to the contractor fixing $1\frac{1}{2}$ months for the execution of the work. About 15 days after the commencement of the work the Order A was issued by the Chairman. It is therefore submitted that the Petitioner was not only not responsible for the letting of road-work on contract but on the other hand he had simply to obey the orders of the Chairman and Council.

As regards charges *b*, *c* and *d*.

First for the maintenance of a large establishment, it is submitted that out of Rs. 441, only Rs. 240 is distributed among the coolies for road work and the balance is being spent upon coolies engaged in Park, Water works and Race course establishments. Moreover they are permanent establishments maintained throughout the year for some years past, the continuance or discontinuance of the same resting with the Council and your Excellency's Government and not with the Petitioner.

Then as for the work turned out by the coolies, it is submitted that from April to September 1890, they had to do road work and a list of the roads repaired by the Petitioner with the coolies (vide E) is submitted. (This list appears in the annual report of last year.) By the end of August the faction in the Council rose to such a high pitch that scarcely a meeting was held for transacting business and that no bills were checked and passed. The financial state of the Municipality was also such that they had spent about 1,000 Rs. or so on roads out of a budget estimate of Rs. 10,000 for the year. As the contractors were not paid even this amount in proper time then and there, they refused to supply materials to roads for the departmental work. After September materials were gathered by the coolies and road work went on a month more. During October, the coolies were engaged in cutting side drains for passing off rain water without injury to roads and houses.

That in addition to the above and other duties which the Petitioner had to do, he was also engaged in the below-mentioned special works :—

(1) Numbering of houses within the whole Municipal limits and the preparation of records of information wanted for the preliminary Census work.

(2) Taking of levels &c. to furnish information to the Sanitary Engineer to the Government in connection with the Water project.

(3) Preparation of License-fees Registers.

(4) Preparation of Measurement Registers for all the houses in the whole Municipality.

(5) Doing duty as Census Supervisor for 2 circles.

[The Census duty commencing from the early part of August and lasting till the end of February].

Then as regards (*e*), the Petitioner begs to submit that this charge is quite unfounded.

8. That the Petitioner respectfully begs to submit that the Chairman's Order (vide C) is more a reflection cast upon the administration of his predecessors rather than a ground for the removal of the Petitioner from his office.

9. That the Petitioner begs to submit that the Chairman's procedure in summarily dispensing with the services of the poor Petitioner all of a sudden for no fault of his leads to the sole and only necessary inference that the Chairman's procedure was high-handed and that it was to provide for one Kristna Row (a dismissed servant) whose appointment was not sanctioned by your Excellency in Council even after the strenuous and repeated recommendations of the present Chairman.

10. That on receipt of the order of the Chairman (vide C) a detailed letter was addressed by the Petitioner to the Chairman for which no reply was received as yet.

11. That the Petitioner in his anxiety to seek employment elsewhere requested the Chairman by means of a letter (vide F) that he be pleased to reconsider his Order and retain the Petitioner in his service for a month more and then accept his resignation which request was not granted at all.

12. That the Chairman without re-taking the Petitioner in service simply recommended to the Council by an endorsement (vide G) that a month's pay be given to the Petitioner as bonus which was sanctioned by the Council by their Resolution (vide H).

13. That the Petitioner then appealed to the Council (vide appeal petition marked J) who also without considering any of the facts alleged in the petition passed the Resolution (vide K) to the effect that they "decline to hear the appeal petition as the Petitioner has resigned."

14. That the Petitioner respectfully begs to submit that the said Resolution of the Council is quite illegal and unjust as it sets out no reasons for declining to interfere and as it laboured under the misapprehension that the Petitioner had resigned inasmuch as the Petitioner's services were dispensed with on the 10th March 1891 (vide C) and the Petitioner was not re-taken in the service and the Petitioner's letter to the Chairman (vide F) could not be viewed as one of resignation.

15. That a careful consideration of the abovementioned facts, will, it is respectfully submitted, convince your Excellency in Council that the Petitioner was guilty of no fault or remissness of duty and that the charge of incompetency is quite unfounded and that the poor Petitioner was unjustly punished for nothing and his prospects were blighted.

It is therefore most respectfully prayed that your Excellency in Council will be graciously pleased to consider the hard case of the Petitioner and direct the restoration of the Petitioner to his post (which post is still vacant without anybody being permanently appointed to it by your Excellency in Council).

For this act of charity and benevolence the Petitioner shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

Your Excellency's most obedient and
humble servant
(Sd) T. C. Lakshmanakrishna Iyer
late Ovr. 18th march 92

List of Exhibits.

A 9—3—91	Memo No. 127 from the Chairman to the Overseer (Petitioner) calling upon him to submit the explanation at once regarding road work carried on in Chittraikara Street.
B 10—3—91	Explanation by the Overseer (Petitioner) to the Chairman.
C 10—3—91	Order by the Chairman dispensing with the services of the Overseer (Petitioner).
D 10—3—91	Letter by the Overseer (Petitioner) to the Chairman about the Order (to which no reply has been sent as yet) showing he had 5 other duties to perform.
E 11—3—91	List of records repaired and metalled during the year 1890—91.
F 18—3—91	Letter by the Overseer to the Chairman requesting for one month's retention and acceptance of resignation afterwards.
G 18—3—91	Endorsement by the Chairman on the petition (document F) by the Overseer that the Overseer may be paid the bonus of one month's pay as his services had to be dispensed with.
H 1—4—91	Extract from the Proceedings of the Council sanctioning one month's pay as his services have been dispensed with.
J 7—6—91	Appeal by the Overseer to the Council.
K 2—6—91	Resolution No. 186 by the Council declining to hear appeal petition as appellant has resigned the office.

COPIES OF EXHIBITS.

——:(o—:•*•:—o):——

A.

No. 127.

The undersigned regrets that the Overseer has not as yet submitted his explanation which he was asked to give last evening regarding the road work now being carried on in Chittarakara Street.

He is informed he will be suspended if he does not send the explanation at once.

(Signed) M. TILLANAYAKAM PILLAI,
Chairman.

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
9th March 1891.

(True Copy)

P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

B.

No. 77.

TO

THE CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
Madura.

SIR,

In obedience to your memo No. 127 dated yesterday I humbly beg to submit this my explanation for your kind and favorable consideration.

I beg to state that the estimate No. 27 was sanctioned by the Council *vide* Resolution $\frac{\text{No. 330.}}{\text{11-11-89.}}$ and tenders invited in September 1890 and consequently Srinivasa Naidu (a partner with Appavoo Pillai Contractor of Road materials supply to the town roads) put in his petition in September.

The estimate was sent to me for execution with an endorsement on M. P. $\frac{\text{No. 725.}}{\text{1890.}}$ informing me that Srinivasa Naidu's tender was accepted in regard to the works and that I should submit a bond for the due execution of the work.

I beg to submit that in obedience to this I sent for the Contractor and asked him to prepare a bond and commence to do the work. He did not appear for about three months after which time he gave me a stamp paper in December 1890. Hereupon I made a report to the Chairman of this that he may be allowed to do the road work alone and that one Sappani Asary may be permitted to do the stone drain work. The Chairman then rebuked him for his absence and then he came to me in February and on the 7th February I got the bond written and asked him to commence the work immediately. He has got time till the 24th Instant and I shall try my best and give you satisfaction by completing the work in a shorter time.

I further beg to submit that the street being a narrow one appears to be blocked when materials are lodged but carts freely pass through it now and that I am pushing on with the work rapidly and therefore I most humbly beg to request you will be graciously kind enough to excuse me for the delay.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant.

(Signed) K. C. SIVARAMAKISTNA IYER,
Municipal Overseer.

MADURA,
10th March 1891.

(True Copy.)

P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

C.

The explanation is most unsatisfactory. There was no necessity at all for letting the work on contract and it should have been done by the road coolies. A large establishment is being maintained at a monthly cost of Rs. 441 for the maintenance of roads and very little was done during the past 15 months. The roads are in a disgraceful condition and even those that were repaired at the end of 1889 have not been properly maintained.

The Overseer and the road coolies did not do their work for the past 12 months and this is due to the inefficiency of the Overseer.

When I was in charge of the Municipality I was obliged to order Chockalingam Pillai to be in charge of the roads. Sivaramakistna Iyer was utterly unequal to the work. He is not a little better now. It is a sheer waste of Municipal money to have him in Municipal service. His services have accordingly been dispensed with. He is ordered to hand over his charge to Chockalingam Pillai at once.

(Signed.) M. TILLANAYAKAM PILLAI,
Chairman,

(True Copy)

P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

D.

TO
M. R. RY.
M. TILLANAYAKAM PILLAI, B.A., RAO BAHADUR,
Chairman,
Municipal Council,
Madura.

SIR,

Being in receipt of your order No. 156 dated 10th March 1891 dispensing with my services I beg to submit that I am now giving over charge of my records &c. to Overseer Mr. Chockalingam Pillai and at the same time beg leave to represent the following few lines for your kind consideration.

2. I humbly beg to submit that the Chairman's order which followed the estimate informed me of the acceptance of Srinivasa Naidu's Tender and directed me to submit a bond for the due execution of work as per estimate prepared by my predecessor Overseer Ramasamy Naidu to be let on contract and sanctioned by the Council as such. Therefore I submit that in letting the work on contract I only obeyed the orders of the Chairman and am innocent in the matter.

3. Of the establishment referred to I beg to state that the amount of Rs. 448 is distributed not to the road coolies alone but also to the establishments of Water works, Public gardens and Park and the Race course. The Water works worked well in the year and the Engine was carefully kept as not to go out of order. The other establishments were doing their respective duties of maintaining the avenues and public gardens.

4. As for the road coolies, I humbly beg to submit that I was in charge of only 15 men out of 33 coolies. The rest were under the orders of Mr. Chockalingam Pillai till last month when about the 5th February I was directed to take all the coolies from him for assisting me in repairing the roads when H. I. H. the

Czarewitch was to come to Madura. With the coolies I have from the beginning of the year remetalled and repaired the roads (a list of which is also submitted) in wards 1,7,8,9 and 10 which alone were entrusted to me. The roads in wards 2-6 were under his supervision and still I had worked in roads of wards 4, 5 and 6 also.

5. I further beg to submit that in addition to my usual miscellaneous work of this Municipality, I was engaged in the below-mentioned special works during the year:—

1. House measurement and preparation of Measurement registers for the whole town (For House tax,)
2 Measurement for License fees and preparation of License fees registers for the whole town.
4. Taking line of levels across the river-bed for 23 Sections for information to the Sanitary Engineer to Government in connection with the Water works.
4. Numbering of houses for Census operations, division of blocks and preparation of building lists &c.
5. Census duty as Supervisor of Circles 1 and 14 but lastly of Circle No. 1.

Thus I submit that I was busily working during the year.

6. In consideration of my future prospects and under the circumstances I most humbly beg to request you will be graciously kind enough to reconsider the order of dispensing with my services and restore me to my appointment.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant,
(Signed) K. C. SIVARAMAKISTNA IYER.

MADURA,
10—3—91.

(True Copy)

P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

E.

MUNICIPAL OFFICE.

List of Roads repaired and remetalled during the year 1890—91.

WARD.	STREET OR ROADS.
4.	Tiruparamkundram Road.
5.	Dindigul Road.
	New Jail Road.
6.	North Masi Street.
	West Gopuram Street.
7.	North Marret Street.
	North Masi Street.
	Line Street.
8.	New Street.
9.	East Marret Street.
	East Veli Vedi.

(Signed) K. C. SIVARAMAKISTNA IYER.

MADURA,
11—3—91.

(True Copy)

P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

F.

I propose that Sivaramakrishna Iyer may be paid one month's pay as his services have to be dispensed with.

(Signed) M. TILLANAYAKAM PILLAI,
Chairman.

18—3—91.

(True Copy)

P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
MADURA, *September* 1891.

G.

TO

THE CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
Madura.

I humbly beg to request that you will be kind enough to keep me in service for one month more so that I may be able to draw one month salary and

also be able to [illegible] yment elsewhere. I further beg to request you to be ki [illegible] resignation after that period.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant.
(Signed) K. C. SIVARAMAKISTNA IYER,

MADURA,
18—3—91.

(True Copy)

P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

H.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Madura Municipal Council passed at the meeting held on Wednesday the 1st April 1891.

* * * * *

60. Read proposal of the Chairman that the Overseer Sivaramakistna Iyer be paid one month's pay as his services have been dispensed with.

Sanctioned.

* * * * *

(Signed) M. TILLANAYAKAM PILLAI,
Chairman.

(True Extract)

P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

J.

TO

THE HONORABLE MEMBERS OF
THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
MADURA,

The humble petition (Appeal) of K. C. Sivaramakistna Iyer, *late Municipal Overseer, Madura,*

MOST RESPECTFUELY SHEWETH :—

1. That the petitioner was first appointed temporarily in 1889 in the Local Fund Engineering department where he acquitted himself satisfactorily and on being recommended by the superior officer of that Department he was taken as Municipal Overseer on probation. The then Chairman after satisfying himself of his work recommended his confirmation to Government which was accordingly sanctioned.

2. Since then your humble petitioner has been devoutly serving the Municipality to the best of his intentions and to the complete satisfaction of the different chairmen and the honorable members of the corporation. A few days after the present Chairman took charge your petitioner was called upon to explain why road materials were lodged in Chitraikara Street ward No. IX. The petitioner submitted his explanation that that work was on contract to one Srinivasa Naidu whose time to complete the work extended for one month more, that the work was in progress and that the lodging of materials was not an obstruction to the traffic in the street.

DEPUTY COLLECTOR OF
A DIVI
3 MAR 96

3. On his explanation of facts the Chairman passed an order to the effect that the explanation being unsatisfactory the services of the petitioner have been dispensed with and that he should hand over charge to Overseer Mr. Chockalingam Pillai on the following grounds viz (1) that there was no necessity for letting the work on contract (2) that a large establishment of coolies were maintained and that no road work was done for the past few months and (3) that the petitioners's inefficiency is the cause of the above.

4. Receiving unexpectedly this order dispensing with his services your petitioner handed over charge as directed and respectfully requested the Chairman to reconsider his order submitting a full explanation of the case and your petitioner received no reply up to date.

5. The petitioner humbly begs to submit that the estimate for Chitraikara Street is one prepared by his predecessor Ramasamy Naidu for letting the work on contract sanctioned by the Council as such and sent to him to have the work executed by a contractor whose tender had been accepted by the Chairman and Council. Under such circumstances to question the necessity or otherwise of letting the work on contract was no business of the petitioner, moreover the letting of works on contract and the inviting of tenders has been always the work of the Chairman and Council and not of overseers who are simply subordinates to carry out orders. So the humble petitioner has done nothing to blame in this matter.

6· Regarding that "no work has been done" the petitioner submits that some work was done in the beginning of the year as long as he was provided with funds for road work and when the Municipality had not sufficient funds, the contractor was not paid, materials were not supplied by him, therefore metalling work was slackened and that he is not at all responsible for the maintenance of the establishment which is a permanent one maintained since some years past. Therefore he submits that it was not owing to his inefficiency but to the want of funds and supply of materials that no road work went on.

7. The petitioner begs to add that he was attending, under the orders of the Chairman, to the road work, census work, petition work and other miscellaneous works of the town such as Water works, furnishing the sanitary engineer with level and sections of Water project and the preparation of License fees registers &c.

8. From the above it will be seen that your poor petitioner was perfectly innocent and he humbly begs therefore to request the honorable members will be gracious enough to consider his case mercifully and restore him to his appointment and render him justice.

For which act of kindness the petitioner shall as in duty bound ever pray.

The Petitioner begs to remain,
Your Most Obedient Servant,
K. C. SIVARAMAKISTNA IYER,

(True Copy)

(Signed) P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

MADURA,
7th June 1891.

K.

Extract from the Procedings of the Madura Municipal Council passed at its meeting held on the 23rd June 1891.

186. Read appeal petition of K. C. Sivaramakistna Iyer requesting restoration to his former post.

As the Appellant has resigned the office, no appeal can be entertained.

* * * * *

Communicated to the petitioner.

(True Copy)

M. TILLANAYAKAM PILLAI,
Chairman.

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
MADURA, *2nd July* 1891.

(True Copy)

(Signed) P. SAMMAVAIER,
Manager for Chairman.

VICTORIA PRESS, MADURA.—15,

2/352 Mofa6

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 352 M

From

K.C.Sivaramakrishna Aiyer,
late Overseer of the Madura
Municipality, now residing
at Sivaganga.

No.

Dated 27-1-96
Received 30-1-96
Enclosures 2

SUBJECT.

Praying that he may be restored to his former appointment as Overseer of the Madura Municipality & be declared that he is not disentitled to reappointment in the municipality.

TO BE RETURNED WITH REPLY.

No. 169

Referred to the Chairman, Municipal Council, Madura, for remarks, which should be submitted through the Collector.

(By order)
W. W. Phillips
Ag. Asst. Secretary

Fort St. George. —
8th February 1896.

K.R.
7/2/96

DEPUTY COLLECTOR, MADURA DIVISION.
FEB. 96

DEPUTY COLLECTOR, MADURA DIVISION
MAR. 96

To The Chairman, M. C. Madura.

Extract from the Proceedings of the Municipal Council Madura, passed at the meeting held on the 14th February 1893.

× × × ×

542. Read G. O. no. 1144 dated 1st July 1892 requesting the Municipal Council to entertain the appeal of the late Overseer Sivaramakrishna Iyer and dispose of it on its merits.

The Overseer has not been dismissed. His resignation was accepted and a month's pay was paid to him.

× × × ×

(Signed) G. Srinivasa Rao
Chairman
Delegate

(True copy)

(Sd) R. Ramachandra Rao
Chairman.

(True copy)

Madura
27.3.1896

83

For Collector

1055 M of 96

Municipal Office

No. 16

Madura 17th February 1896.

CURRENT No. 1055 M

From M.R.Ry. R. Ramachandra Row Avl. B.A.
Chairman, Municipal Council,
Madura.

To
The Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort St. George,
Madras.

Through The Collector of
Madura.

Sir,

I have the honor to return Current No: 169, appeal petition of K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer late Municipal Overseer and report as follows:—

2. Petitioner's Services were dispensed with on the 10th March 1891; on the 18th March 1891 he sent in letter G; the Municipal Council resolved on the 1st April 1891 that a bonus of a month's pay be Sanctioned, this

this was sanctioned in G.O dated 21st May 1891 No: 763 M. Mis. On the 7th (not 17th) June 1891, petitioner appealed to the Council which resolved on the 23rd June 1891 that no appeal can be entertained as appellant had resigned. Petitioner appealed to Government and in G.O dated 1st July 1892 No. 1144 M. Mis: Government ordered that it was clear from the papers that appellant had not resigned and remanded the appeal for disposal on its merits. The Council resolved thereupon in contravention of the G.O that the Overseer was not dismissed but that his resignation was accepted vide resolution No: 542 dated 14th February 1893.

3. A vacancy occurred in the Overseership in April 1894 and petitioner was recommended; and in Memorandum dated 12th May 1894 No: 357 Government enquired why he was recommended in face of the strong allegations

1055

(with Indorsement)

allegations against petitioner under which it was considered necessary to remove petitioner summarily. In reply thereto the Chairman replied that the recommendatio was made because in his opinion he did no consider the grounds of disposal dismissal such as would disentitle petitioner for reappointment; the Chairman omitted to report the resolution of the Council No: 542 dated 14th February 1893; an alternative recommendation was made which was approved of by Government vide G.O dated 9th June 1894 No: 731 M. Mis:

4. I am not certain if I am to offer remarks on the original grounds of dismissal; Mr. Tillanayakam Pillai's estimate of petitioner is contained in letter dated 8th April 1891 No: 13 read in G.O. dated 21st May 1891, No: 763 M. Mis:; while Mr. Fischer's opinion is

contained in letter dated 17th May 1894 No: 16
read in G.O. dated 9th June 1894 No: 731 M.
Mis: Petitioner has never worked under me.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Manachandran
Chairman.

Wd
16 Feb

1/ 1055

contained in letter dated 17th May 1894 No: 16
read in G.O. dated 9th June 1894 No: 731 M.
Mis: Petitioner has never worked under me.

Further information and
papers had to be sent for.
In spite of the Resolution of 14th Feb
1893 it is clear that the man's
services were dispensed with. He
was considered so incompetent
that a month's wages was given
him in lieu of a month's notice.
It is misleading to call this
grant a bonus.

Copy of Resolution of 14.2.93

767/6
Genl
18.2.96 Dr

1896.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

CURRENT No. 1055 M

R. FROM

THE CHAIRMAN,
MUNICIPAL COUNCIL,
MADURA.

No.

ENCLOSURE. One + G.O. 352 M with

Dated } 17th February 1896.
Received }

No. 16.

SUBJECT.

Reporting on the appeal-petition of K.C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer late Municipal overseer Madura.

COLLECTOR'S OFFICE 15 FEB 96 MADURA

(with order)

N Dis No 767/Genl of 96

Submitted.

2 Further information and the papers had to be sent for.

3 In spite of the Resolution of 14th Feby 1893 it is clear that the overseer's services were dispensed with. He was considered so incompetent that a month's wages was given him in lieu of a month's notice. It is misleading to call this grant a 'bonus'.

4 Copy of Resolution d/ 14.2.93 is enclosed.

Madura }
27.3.96 }

[illegible]
Collector.

UNDER SECRETARY 30 MAR 96

Cas: 352+1055 M

CS
misc

order No. 748 Mis d 4.5.96

The Government sees no reason to interfere on behalf of the Petitioner.

V.R.
22/4/96

WWD
24.4.96

Desp. 7/5/96

To the Petitioner
S/[illegible] Chairman [illegible]

---

n for
ed
min

G.
25 A.
1,000—21-3-96.

DEPARTMENT

C. No.

FOR ORDERS.

I certainly would not interfere after such a lapse of time

WS
30/4/96

Spec

The proposed order can issue

[illegible]
1-5-96

I do not feel quite certain what to do with this case. If the disposal lay entirely with me I would pass the order drafted by the Office but You may perhaps think otherwise.

The case is this.

The petr. was an overseer in the Madura Municipality and on the 10th March 1891 the then Chairman dispensed with his services. The reason for this will be seen from the Chairmans letter in G.O No 731/21.5.91 (marked with red tape)

On the 18th of the same month the petr. wrote the letter (exhibit C marked with white tape in the Current) On this the Council passed a resolution (disposed of by G.O quoted above) granting the petr. a months salary in lieu of notice — this was the effect of the resolution which did not accept the resignation & made no reference to it. The then went

to the Mul. Council which in its Resolution dated 23rd June 1891 held that as the petr. had resigned no appeal lies. (vide p. 13 of the Current)

The petitioner in March 1892 appealed to Govt. for an order for his restoration. The order on this (G.O. No 1144 dated 1.7.92) stated that as it was clear that the petr had been dismissed the [illegible] finally should decide the appeal on its merits.

On this the Council in Resolution No 542 dated 13th July 1893. decided that the petr had not been dismissed, and that his resignation had been accepted.

Such acceptance could have been only by implication as there is nothing on record about it.

In April 1894 Mr Fischer then Chairman recommended the petr. without saying a word about his previous history. I recollected it and called for explanation. The result was that another man was put in (G.O. No. 731 dated 9/6/94.). Nothing further occurred until January of this year when the petr again

FOR ORDERS.

H. M.

en for co
pied
amined
ence

G.
25 A.
1,900—21-3-96.

DEPARTMENT

C. No.

FOR ORDERS.

came up to Govt. after a lapse of between three and four years. I think that it is clear that the man's services were dispensed with; he was practically dismissed. He did tender his resignation but that this was accepted there is nothing to show excepting the Resolution of the 23rd June 1891. He was to the then Chairman Tillanackam Pillay who was a Dy. Collr & a good Officer & who believed utterly useless. Mr. Fischer who wished to take him on again later on apparently had no personal experience of him.

If the statement in the Resolution of June 1891 is accepted no appeal lay but if it is held that the petr services were dispensed with by the Chairman the main case has never been considered by the Council on its merits. But his long silence may perhaps be taken as an acceptance of the repetition in the resolution of the 13th of July 1893 ~~thereto~~ of the assertion that the petr had resigned – as he certainly did – and that his resignation had been accepted of which there is no definite records.

Taking all these circumstances ~~and~~ the great delay in coming up to Govt ~~[illegible]~~ ~~[illegible]~~ and to what a Chairman who had had to deal with him said as to his inefficiency into consideration, I would, were I the appellate authority, decline to interfere but H.Ex may think the man still entitled to consideration of his appeal on its merits by the Council.

No copy of resolution No 542 dated 13th July 1893 was ever sent up (it need not have been) so Govt was in ignorance of what the Council had done

J.D.
29/4/96

K C Swaminathakrishn
petn.

FOR ORDERS.

H. M.

1055 M

C 1/4

1301/4

…en for copying ____
…pied ____
…amined ____
…ned ____
189 .

Ord…

Lette…

Stateme…

A A A A A

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.

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

G.O. No. DATED

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
No. [illegible]
10 DEC. 95
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE.

DEPUTY COLLECTOR, MADURA DIVISION.
3- MAR. 96

TESTIMONIALS

OF

K. C. SIVARAMAKRISHNA IYER

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.

TESTIMONIALS

IN FAVOUR OF

K. C. SIVARAMAKRISHNA IYER

University of Madras.

MATRICULATION EXAMINATION, 5502

I hereby certify that K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer passed the Matriculation Examination, held in the month of December 1885 his optional language being Tamil and that he was placed in the Second Class.

Registrar's Office, (Signed) W. H. WILSON, PH. D.,
The 18th March 1886. *Registrar*

I do hereby certify that I have examined K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer a candidate for employment in the Civil Engineering College at Madras and cannot discover that he has any disease, constitutional affection or bodily infirmity. His age is according to his own statement sixteen years and by appearance about 16 years. He bears marks of Small pox.

(Signed) A. PORTER, M. D., F. R. C. S. I., & M. R. I. A.,
Madras *Surgeon, 4th District.*
4th August 1886

K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer was a student under me in the Matriculation Class in 1885. He was regular in attendance, intelligent, persevering and well behaved.

Trevandram (Signed) P. AIYAPPEN PILLAI B. A.,
23rd March 1886 *Assistant, College, Trivandram.*

K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer studied under me for a year in the Matriculation Class of H. H. The Maharajah's College. He was attentive and well behaved in Class, and displayed very fair proficiency in English the subject he learnt under me.

H. H. The Maharaja's College.

(Signed) M. LABOUCHARDIERE, M. A.,
Trivandram 24th May 1886. *Assistant in English.*

K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer studied in the Sixth Class here for one year and passed the Matriculation Examination held last December. His Masters speak of him as diligent and persevering and of average intelligence. His conduct in the Class was satisfactory. He leaves to join the C. E. College.

Trivandram (Signed) Rob. HARVEY, M. A., L. L. D.,
24th March 1886 *Ag. Principal.*

K, C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer attended the lectures given by me on Chemistry and Physics to the Matriculation Class during the year 1885. I found him to be a diligent and intelligent student. His conduct was uniformly good.

Trivandram (Signed) HENRY N. READ, M. A.,
March 27th 1886 *Professor of Chemistry & Physical Science,*
in H. H. the Maharaja's College.

K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer was a student in the Engineer Subordinates' Class, College of Engineering, for 2½ years. I found him active and intelligent in surveying and levelling and I believe that he will always do well at that kind of work. His conduct has been good and I would be glad to hear of his advancement.

(Signed) J. HAMILTON,
Madras *Instructor in Surveying & Drawing,*
7th February 1889. *College of Engineering.*

K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer was a pupil of mine in the Engineer Subordinates' Class in this College. During that time I found his work satisfactory and his conduct in class excellent.

College of Engineering (Signed) E. W. MIDDLEMAST B. A.,
Madras, 7th February 1889. *Professor of Mathematics.*

Testimonial for service in the Local Fund Engineering Department when J. O'Shaugnessey Esq., was District Board Engineer of Madura.

K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer now an Overseer in the Madura Municipality has asked me to give him a few lines as to the nature of his work under me as a temporary Surveyor in L. F. Department.

This I have much pleasure in giving as I was perfectly satisfied with his work as a Surveyor and if he had continued in this temporary service I have no doubt that he would have been provided with an Overseership in this department.

He is well up in surveying, drawing and estimating. He was well behaved, obedient and painstaking and it would afford me much pleasure to hear that he is doing well in the profession he had adopted by undergoing his studies through the prescribed course of training in the Madras Civil Engineering College for an Overseer in the D. P. W.

(Signed) SUB-DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
Madura.

Local & Municipal Department,
Madura, Collector's Office,
20th August 1889.

Chief Secretariat,
Madras.

Proceedings of the Government of Madras

Read the following paper :—

Endorsement of the Collector of Madura dated 24th July 1889 No. 265 on letter from the Chairman Municipal Council, Madura, dated

17th July 1889 No. 15 praying sanction for the appointment of K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer as Municipal Overseer on a pay of Rs 50 and 12 (horse allowance).

Order thereon of 15th August 1889, No. 1027, Mis.

"Sanctioned"

(True Extract)

(Signed) W. L. C. BADDLEY Captain, R. E,
Under Secretary P. W. D,
for Chief Secretary.

To the Chairman, Municipal Council,
Through the Collector.

Extract from the Remarks of the District Medical and Sanitary Officer Madura District, on the progress report of Hospital works, dated 15th October General No. 530.

"I have checked the work and made my remarks thereon. The work has been done well and within the estimate framed by Overseer Chocalingam Pillai and deserves credit to Overseer Mr. K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer".

The bearer K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer was appointed by me as Overseer in the Madura Municipality when I was the Chairman of that Institution, I always found him to be hardworking and attentive to his duties. He is also a willing servant. I was much satisfied with his work and have nothing to say against his honesty. As he is a well behaved and steady young man, I hope he will get on well in any department he wishes to enter.

Madura,
25th November 1890.

(Signed) M. ALAGIRISAWMI,
Chairman.

The bearer K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer, Municipal Overseer adura, served under me for the last two years when I was a Ward ouncillor and since I became Chairman of the Municipal Corporation. He was always found to be hardworking and very attentive to discharge his duties to the entire satisfaction of his superiors. During this period of his service, he was in charge of the *Public works* and the *Water works* of the Municipality.

(Signed) M. V. APPASAWMI NAIDU, *Rao Bahadur,*
Chairman, Municipal Council, Madura.

Madura,
20th February 1891

Letter from Chairman, Municipal Council, informing of the order of the Madras Government sanctioning the bonus.

Municipal Office,
5th June 1891.

No. 592.

Mr. K. C. Sivaramakrishna Iyer is hereby informed that Government have in their order No. 763. M. Mis. 21-5-91, sanctioned the proposal of the Madura Municipal Council to pay him a month's pay of Rs. 50, &c.

(Signed) CHAIRMAN,
Municipal Council.