

Local & Munl. (1895) Department

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1604M

DATED 5th October 1895

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition.

Withholding, under the authority quoted, the----from
P.K. Chathu, late Hospital Assistant, Tellicherry, to the Right
Honourable the Secretary of State for India praying that he
may be reinstated to his former post.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

The humble memorial of P. H. Chathu
late hospital assistant Chali, Jellicherry.

most respectfully sheweth,

That the undersigned most respectfully
ventured to trespass upon the precious moments of your
excellency in council with the following humble memorial
in the humble hope that his sad case will excite the
sympathy of your excellency in council and at last he
will meet with that justice which is the proverbial
trait of the benign British nation.

1. He was in charge of the Chali
Hospital within the Jellicherry Municipality from 1891
to 1892.

2. The Civil Surgeon and the municipal
chairman fell out as to the authority and supervision
over the said branch hospital and from party feeling
the Civil Surgeon insisted upon your excellency's humble
memorialists' dismissal from municipal service. The
chairman protested most emphatically against this,
in the following terms. "The charges against the
hospital assistant are almost all malicious. He gives
me great satisfaction in the discharge of his duty. He
it not been for him the attendance at the Chali
Dispensary would not be so good as it is. I therefore
am of opinion that I cannot consciously dismiss him
from municipal service. I would not be doing
my duty if I did so. (para 3 enclosure L)

Surgeon General
of immediate dismissal from municipal employment
can be admitted as a sufficient punishment for the
misbehaviour of the hospital assistant referred to.
Should he not be dismissed the amount provided
for in the budget for the payment of his salary
will be struck out of the budget."

Order dated 6th April 1891 no. 5000 mis
enclosed your excellency in council will be pleased
to observe from the above extracts that the order of
dismissal of your excellency's humble memorialist
was not the Chairman's, but emanated from the
Madras Government and therefore to say that he
has been dismissed by the chairman and therefore
the chairman's orders are final in the case is a matter
of great grievance to your excellency's poor memorialist.

He therefore most respectfully ventures
to submit that the discretionary power claimed by
the Madras Government in withholding his
memorial to the India Government is not
warranted by the facts and circumstances of his
sad case. The chairman in the case he most
respectfully ventures to point out was a most
unwilling medium through whom the premptory
orders of the Madras Government have simply
been communicated to him.

As the details of the facts and
circumstances

to this m
be superfluous to dwell upon them again here.

Under these circumstances he most respectfully ventures to solicit your excellency in council will be most graciously pleased to favour-ably consider his humble memorial and benignly make out to him that justice and fair-play which have hitherto been denied him for which he will as in duty bound.

Ever pray.

6th September 1895
Tellierry.

P. V. Chuthu

From the Under Secretary to the Government of
India, Home Department, medical, dated
19th February 1895 n^o. 65, forwarding petition
from P. K. Chattru appealing 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 Jellicherry municipality
and requesting that 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.

Order 7th March 1895 n^o. 372 m. mis.

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

(True extract)

Sd/- W. Francis

Ag. Asst. Secretary
For Chief Secretary.

True copy

P. K. Chattru

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)

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 Hospital 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.

CIVIL DISPENSARY TELlichERRY.
23rd June 1890.

No. 139.

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

P.H.E

as the Hospital Assistant in charge of the Branch Dispensary disease *Cough* as it is merely one symptom of a large class of

necessary that Mr. Cooper should have waited till he was called to the capacity of the Hospital Assistant in charge at present. The glaring to be passed over lightly and as the supervising officer bringing to your notice the doings of the Hospital Assistant. In his suffering from Encephalites which signifies inflammation of this is the most serious disease that can attack a man, but strangely at the Branch Dispensary and was treated, therapeutically in, same day he got two mixtures, one containing the Bromide and other Strychnine, Sulphate of Iron, Nitro Muriatic acid and such treatment will not emanate from a competent man, for the patient will simply bring him to his grave. The lives of the donor's advice and aid are the least to say in a very critical

ned by Mr. Cooper yesterday to the Hospital Assistant at Chali, to take charge of, but has written a letter without any heading. I therefore forward them to you.

the honor to inform you that the day I took charge, I went over although it was 20 minutes to 4 P. M. I found the Dispensary the Hospital Assistant was to be found. I particularly wished to with the Hospital Assistant, as he has already treated a case of take the necessary precautions to prevent as far as possible the its usual hot bed, Chali, but my visit was quite useless owing to ordinate.

or if you will ascertain and inform me at your earliest convenient the subject of my supervision and the extent of my control

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.

labar, dated 2nd August, 1890, No. 359, submitting for con-
sinal relating to the attitude assumed by the Chairman, Municipi-
the Civil Surgeon, Tellicherry etc.

with the Government of Madras, Fort St. George, dated 26th

memo No. 673 L. and M. dated 2nd September, 1890. I have
nation of Government, that after a careful examination of the
ary which were received in this office on the 22nd Instant,

er opposite No. 101, a case is entered as "Encephalites," and
shown to be treated with Sulphate of iron. As the patient
a grave error of diagnosis must have occurred.

3. This patient is farther 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. ^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 Strychniae.

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 infallible. Is the diagnosis of even the best of Medical men always correct? Is their treatment always befitting, and what is Mr. Chathan in

N.H.C

N.H.C

comparisons" which is an acknowledgement of the error committed by Hospital Assistant, Chathan, and printed by me. The erasures and corrections must have been done by the Hospital Assistant 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. 533.

With reference to Memorandum No. 949 dated the 14th November 1890, I have the honor to report that the error made by this office, Chathu Menon does not appear to have ever been employed in Municipal service. It will however be seen from the enclosed copy of a letter from the President of the 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 the error of the G. O., I have the honor to state that Strychnine was not prescribed in the case of the patient in my letter, No. 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 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 correct. I may state, as desired by Government, that the prescription of Strychnine is an error in the treatment of Encephalites.

(ENCLOSURE E)

The Surgeon-General dated, 17th January 1891 No. 58 M. Mis. The 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 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 nature 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,
21st May 1885.

P. K. Chathu Menon entered the Municipal service as Assistant Dy. Inspector of Vaccination on the 26th May 1885, 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 was 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. D. C. H.
Surg. M. D.
Health Officer
Madras Municipal Council.

DR. GOVINDAN, LATE CHAIRMAN
CERTIFICATE.

Mr. P. K. Chathu, Hospital Assistant, was in charge of the Chal 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.

MUNICIPAL OFFICE,
Tellicherry 23-9-90.

No. 533.

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 Central 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.

P. K. C.

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 is inexpedient to wait till the District officer could spare a hand as Cholera was prevailing at Chicut and other places in the vicinity.

I have &c.

(Signed) A. GOVINDAN,
Chairman.

(True copy)

No. 967.

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 Chathoo 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 "Encephalitis" 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 Chali 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)

10th September, 1891.
TELICHERRY.

(ENCLOSURE G.)

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.

SHREWETH,

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 join a brief history of 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 always been a hotbed of infectious diseases. In fact every outbreak of Cholera, Small-pox and other scourges 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. Chathoo, 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. Chathoo, 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. Chathoo meant a decrease of practice to those in the Tellicherry Civil Dispensary, these latter, out of spite at the preference shown by Mr. Chathoo 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.

P.H.C.

P.H.C.

(ENCLOSURE H.)

To

MR. P. K. CHATHU
LATE HOSPITAL ASST. CHALIL,
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 18th 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 desires to reconsider the orders already passed in this case.

(True extract)

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

To

The Petitioners.

P. K. Chathu

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

P. K. C

January 1882 No. 122
passed in the Petitioner's

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 3rd 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.

P. K. Chathu

From P. K. Chathu, 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 re-in-
statement with arrears of pay & his
part from which he has been so unjustly
dismissed.

Order 3rd November 1894, No. 1620 M. Mis.

Under rule no. 2 of the Rules
in G. O. of 36th October 1891 No. 1654 M,
which have the force of Law, the Chairman
order of dismissal in this case is final.
The appeal now preferred thus falls
under clause (8), Section III of the memo-
rules printed in G. O. of 18th November 1888,
No. 931 Public, and is accordingly
withheld under the discretion vested
in Govt. by that rule.

(True extract)

Edw. L. Davidson.

Asst. Secy.
for Chief Secretary

(True copy)

To the Petitioner

P. K. Chathu

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. Lafranaix 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. $\frac{c}{ii}$ 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 Memorialist'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) "the 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 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, 61, 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-

M.H.C.

M.H.C.

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 case 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 Chali 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 other 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 satisfy 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.

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, 26th, 29th and 31st May 1890, and in the cases mentioned in paras 4 and 5 of the Surgeon General's letter No. 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 the only cases where "S" appears to be put down in the Nominal Register, and supply an item of accusation against your Memorialist. Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to note that out of a total of one thousand cases treated by Memorialist and entered in the Nominal Register, and only cases are marked with "S" and that too, quite different handwriting, as is notably the case in No. 157; that the "S"s are conspicuous by their absence both in the original entries and also be graciously taken into con-

sideration 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 unbiased, 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 dated 7th January 1891 (Enclosure

P.N.C.

P.N.C.

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 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. In the heat of the moment, under the excitement of the 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 salary 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 a really grave sin.

18. The second charge 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. 10 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 perusal 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 as the disease Encephalites is not easy to diagnose and difficult to treat. In the excitement natural at the prospect of a long cherished wish being gratified, he 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 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 repetition to the Chairman condemning the professional efficiency of the Memorialist in making a repetition in strong terms, but meaning to become a party question and the Civil Surgeon over-awed by the representation of Mr. Cooper and with-while Mr. Cooper was transferred from the station, it happened in the tone and wording of as to the superiority of the authority of the Chairman who succeeded was induced to espouse the cause out of an *esprit de corps* simply on the representation of Mr. Cooper and with-while Mr. Cooper was transferred from the station, it happened in the tone and wording of 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 with-while Mr. Cooper was transferred from the station, it happened in the tone and wording of out 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) that he saw distinctly Encephalites in 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 humble Memorialist submits, is the nearest approach possible to the true origin of

N.H.C

N.H.C

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 at the moment that he was really in error in the diagnosis and prescription of case No. 320, 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 outweigh 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 signatories of G. Memorial. He humbly asks that Enclosure A. might be considered side by side with his own humble representation.

P. K. CHATHU.

P. K. Chathu

*6 September 1895
Tellierry.*

A A

11. SEP 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

8

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. 320, 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 outweigh 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 signatories of G. Memorialist humbly asks that Enclosure A. might be considered side by side with his own humble representation.

P. K. CHATHU.

P. K. Chathu

*September 1895
Tellicherry.*

[9]

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT

PAPER, No.

OF 189

Local & Municipal Department
CURRENT No.

OTHER PAPER, No.

OF 189

From

P. K. Chathu.

*late Hospital Asst. in charge,
Tellicherry*

No.

Dated 6-9-95

Received 14-9-95

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

*Submitting a memorial to the
Right Honble the Secretary of State
for India, praying that he may
be reinstated with arrears of
pay to his former post of Hospital
Asst. in Charge of Chali Dispensary,
Tellicherry.*

Copied by

Examined by *R.*

Gov

8

the charges of inefficiency and falsification of severe and painful G. against him, without a in his own defence.

Even granting for the moment that he and prescription of case No. 320, it will be rem instance out of no less than 1,500 cases where two Civil Surgeons, and the Surgeon General He humbly leaves it to your Excellency in Co sufficient to outweigh the testimony to the Diploma and the certificates of efficiency as insubordination and unsatisfactory antecedents it is needless to repeat them here. He begs with the fervent and humble prayer that you graciously pleased to cancel the above G. office from which he has been so cruelly ousted Justice he shall, as in duty bound,

Order - 10/10/95
The memorial will be withheld under Section 111 (10) of the memorial rules A.

Note.
see sa go. 1620. M. 2.11.94
of India have already declined to
inform - go. 272.11.94
W. 1.10.95

P. S.

Memorialist regrets that owing to the the Municipal Office, the certified copies of illness of his, this humble memorial has the delay on his part will be graciously for

When this Memorial was in the Enclosures G. and H. from Messrs. signatoris of G. Memorialist humbly side by side with his own humble rep

5
2840 10/10/95

The Petitioners
with a copy of the rule
Dup 11/10/95

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 DISPATCH IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

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

OTHER PAPER, No.

OF 119

OTHER PAPER, No.

OF 189

Copied by
Examined by R

INDEXED
Miscellaneous.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPT.

G.O., DATED 5-10-95
No. 1604-M

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Petition

Withholding under
authority quoted the
from P. H. Chatur, Late
Hapl. asst., Tellicherry,
to the Rt. Hon^{ble} Secy.
State for India praying
that he may be reinstated
to his former post.

t owing to
ified copies
monial ha
graciously
as in
lessre
ambl
re

Sc
7cl

tent.	Date.
-------	-------

When given for copying _____
 When copied _____
 When examined _____
 When signed _____

} 189

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

CURRENT No.

Date.

ENCLOSURES TO O. No.

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

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPEES NOT FILED UP, BRING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.B. —

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