

(1) Number of pages 8
(2) Date of repair 26-6-42
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	635	Press
		~~Mis.~~
605-606.		
Dated	31-3-	1862.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
31st March 1862.*

No. 605. Read the following Memorandum from Lieutenant-Colonel J. OUCHTERLONY, Acting Deputy Chief Engineer, Northern Circle, to Lieutenant-Colonel W. H. HORSLEY, Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Chepauk, 14th February 1862, No. 210, N. 29 :—

1 Inspection Report.	
1 Letter No. 2,143, dated 25th November 1861, with one enclosure.	Submitting for the information of Government in pursuance of Order No. 426, dated 12th March 1862, the entire correspondence connected with the case of G. Appavoo late Sub-Overseer in the Nellore District.
1 Do. No. 2,272, dated 12th December 1861.	
1 Do. to do. No. 8,365, dated 14th December 1861.	
1 Do. from G. Appavoo, dated 17th January 1862.	
1 Do. to District Engineer, No. 10,103, dated 1st Feb. 1862.	
1 Do. from do. No. 252, dated 7th February 1862.	
1 Do. to Appavoo, No. 139, dated 24th February 1862.	
1 Do. to do. No. 131, dated 4th March 1862.	
1 Original Petition with enclosure.	

No. 606. ORDER THEREON, 31st March 1862, No. 635.

Petitioner G. Appavoo, late Sub-Overseer in the Nellore District, will be informed in reply to his Petition dated 10th March 1862, that Government, having sent for and attentively read and considered the whole of the correspondence connected with his case, see no reason to question the justice of his dismissal from the service.

(Signed) W. H. HORSLEY, Lieut.-Colonel,
Secretary to Government.

To

Colonel W. H. Howley
Secretary to Government
D. P. W.

The humble Petition of G.
Appavoo, late ^{Sub} Overseer of the Kallor
District.

Respectfully Sheweth,

That your Petitioner having been dismissed from the post of Sub Overseer on insufficient grounds, was induced to appeal to the Deputy Chief Engineer Northern Circle. Copy of your Petitioner's representation is herewith forwarded, which enters so fully into the particulars of his unfortunate case that it seems unnecessary to do more than to advert to the most striking features thereof in order to show that the grounds of his dismissal are utterly untenable. The result of your Petitioner's appeal to the Deputy Chief Engineer will appear from the accompanying copy of a Memo. N^o 139 dated 24th February 1862.

As it appeared therefrom that after a perusal of the District Engineer's report against your Petitioner, and your Petitioner's defence, the Deputy Chief Engineer considered it proper to refer the subject of the representation to the District Engineer, and that the Confirmation of the dismissal was based on the District Engineer's further explanation; your Petitioner applied to the Deputy Chief Engineer for Copies of the Correspondence that had taken place in order that he might be in a position to reply to any allegations preferred

Enclosures 3 2/3
1 Appeal to the Deputy Chief Engineer
2 Endorsement from do.

preferred which were not made in the District Engineer's first Memo. Containing a abstract of the grounds of his removal. The result of this application will appear from the enclosed Memo N^o 181 dated 4th Instant. Your Petitioner is however, encouraged to find that the grounds of his removal rest as they were when his first representation was framed, as he presumes from that fact that the District Engineer has urged nothing new to substantiate the charges against your Petitioner, and he humbly trusts that the facts and circumstances set forth so fully in the enclosed Appeal to the Deputy Chief Engineer will be found to meet satisfactorily the points in the District Engineer's Memorandum against him.

His Original estimate for the repair of the Iron Tank was Rupees 11,000 and more and on account of the smallness of the allotment of funds, it was reduced by Mr Irving to Rupees 9300 and only Rupees 6507 of the work provided for in the estimate was actually carried out in the time of Captain Greenaway. The work performed was duly inspected by that Officer and the Bill for the same paid. nor the slightest suspicion was entertained at the time of any fraud, having been practised. No-body complained of your Petitioner's proceedings until now. Nearly a year elapsed and then your Petitioner was called upon to identify work which various Causes prevented the possibility of his doing. Your Petitioner would beg leave to premise that by calling into question at present the honesty with which the repairs were executed is obviously calling into question the intelligence and fitness of Captain Greenaway himself for his duties. It cannot be supposed that that Officer would be so unmindful of his obligations as to fail to exercise that Circumspection during his inspection of an important work on which a large outlay had taken place. Putting aside those inferential deductions, Your Petitioner will proceed to state the facts of this Case.

Y^{rs}

5
It is admitted that the Tank had received nearly three fourths of its supply of water during the interval between the Completion of repairs and the present District Engineer's measurement.

Your Petitioner's own immediate Superior Mr Irving admits that on that account it is scarcely possible to make any accurate measurement after the lapse of 12 months of work performed. Nevertheless the District Engineer insisted on the pits excavated being pointed out, though most of them were under water during measurement, and having been dug on irrigated lands, they had been disturbed by the Cultivators. The District Engineer measured several pits continuously, and wanted your Petitioner to show them in the pit Register, though your Petitioner had urged that owing to the unevenness of the ground, they were marked off in different places, and could not be identified.

The clearest evidence of how unfair it was to expect to be able to measure and to value work done after a twelve month under the disadvantages already alluded to, is the remarkable disagreement in the result of the measurements taken by the District Engineer Mr Irving and Captain Richardson respectively of the Stone work, as explained in Para 5 of his appeal to the Deputy Chief Engineer, and another fact worthy of attention is the superficial nature of the examination of the District Engineer also referred to in that Paragraph.

Your Petitioner was also charged for having failed to report that the old structure had been damaged during the monsoon of 1860, though he did actually do so to Captain Greenaway; and even if your Petitioner's affirmation on this head is to be disbelieved, he begs to add that he did make an entry in the Station Book that the damage to work had been restored. Your Petitioner also trusts that the explanation given in Para 6 of his appeal to the Deputy Chief Engineer will show that the Rs paid for replacing

12 March 1862

Col. H. H. H. 1862. D. 1862
P. 30. of Court for Frank

For 1864

The Capt. J. A. H.
H. H. H. H. H.
to the day for H. H.
H. H. H.

Antel 11. March 1862
H. H. H.

1862. 1862. 1862.
1862. 1862. 1862.

11. 1862. 1862.

Forward the notice
concerning the case of
H. H. H. H. H.
H. H. H. H. H.
H. H. H. H. H.

1862. 1862. 1862.

1862. 1862. 1862.
1862. 1862. 1862.

1862. 1862.

Petitioner J. H. H.

Let the answer in the State
Districts will be informed in 1862
his petition dated 1862. March 1862 that
Government, having sent for every
attending need and considered the
value of the correspondence con-
nected with his case see necessary
to proceed the justice of his dismission
from the service. 1862. 1862.

1862. 1862. 1862.
1862. 1862. 1862.

1862. 1862.

1862. 1862. 1862.
1862. 1862. 1862.