

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair 27-12-1965

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. <u>2499</u>	Press
<u>644-645</u>	~~Mis.~~
Dated <u>28-8-1965</u> .	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

y

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
28th August 1865.*

No. 644. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel G. V. WINSCOM, R. E., Superintending Engineer, 2nd Division, to Colonel C. A. ORR, R. E., Secretary to Government, Department Public Works, dated Masulipatam, 10th August 1865, No. 55:—

SIR,

In forwarding a Memorandum reviewing charges made against Delta Superintendent Madava Row, by his Range Officer, Lieutenant Vibart; and ordering his dismissal, I have the honor with reference to paragraph 10, Chapter XII., Code of Public Works, to solicit the instructions of Government as to whether the security money and its interest, also the pay now due to the late Delta Superintendent may be retained, to compensate in part for the loss caused by him.

No. 431.

MEMORANDUM.

1. In his letter No. 75 of 30th June, Lieutenant Vibart, the Officer in charge of No. 1 Range, brings to notice the inaccurate measurements of Delta Superintendent Madava Row, employed in widening the western bank channel.

2. This letter having been forwarded to Madava Row, in order that he may explain as far as possible the alleged inaccuracies, he has replied at length in a letter dated 10th July 1865.

3. Lieutenant Vibart forwards remarks on the Delta Superintendent's letter in a Memorandum dated 16th July.

4. I have very carefully read over these documents, and fully considered both the charges on one side and the explanations on the other. There is no kind of work which affords a greater opportunity for fraud than earthwork, and therefore it is most necessary that the Executive Officer's orders should be strictly carried out. This Madava Row has clearly not done, and has in consequence rendered it impossible to verify the breadths of his cuttings. With regard to the depths, the statement made by Madava Row that he measured differently to Lieutenant Vibart, furnishes insufficient excuse, for if Lieutenant Vibart's method of having horizontal measurement gives too little in one case, as in that where the bank slopes from the lip, it would give the reverse when the ground slopes to the lip. But Madava Row's measurements are *all* in excess, *all* to the disadvantage of the Government, and the profit of the diggers or himself. This circumstance in itself is *most suspicious*, but I am not of opinion that actual fraud can be charged upon him in a Court of Law, unless it could be proved that the sums charged were not paid to the workmen, or that he had again received money from the Wudders. It is further to be noted that Lieutenant Vibart's measurements are compared with the least of Madava Row's, so that the latter has every advantage afforded him. The deficiency caused by these mismeasurements is Rupees 732.

5. I further note that this is not the first time Madava Row has been accused by his Range Officer. Captain Hasted found a great deficiency in his lime accounts, and Colonel Anderson, the then Superintending Engineer, ordered him to pay up Rupees 480-2-9, the value of chunam not accounted for by him, which Madava Row did; and in his Memorandum No. 297, dated 11th December 1863, on this matter, Colonel Anderson stigmatizes the Delta Superintendent's conduct in the matter as "very suspicious," and recommends that in future he should be trusted with no work which could not be checked by prompt measurement.

6. I am also aware that Madava Row's reputation for honesty among the Officers of the Department has for long been at a low ebb.

7. Under these circumstances I deem it my duty to dismiss Delta Superintendent Madava Row from Government employ, and to request the orders of Government as to whether his deposit

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
28th August 1865.

of Rupees 200 (amounting now with interest to Rupees 225) shall be retained as a fraction of the loss which his inefficiency, if not dishonesty has caused. Lieutenant Vibart will be directed also to retain any arrears of pay now due to Madava Row until further orders.

MASULIPATAM,
10th August 1865.

(Signed) G. V. WINSOM, Lieut-Colonel, R. E.,
Superintending Engineer, 2nd Division

No. 645.

ORDER THEREON, 28th August 1865, No. 2,499.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 83.

As it appears from the Memorandum accompanying this letter that the charge of fraud preferred against Madava Row cannot be substantiated in a Court of Law, the Govern-

ment consider it inexpedient that the amount deposited by that individual as security, as well as the arrears of salary due to him, should be withheld.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) CHARLES A. ORR, Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 2nd Division.
.. Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exl. S. T. Augustin.

1255-
0000

Superintending Engineer's Office
Masulipatam
10th August 1865

From

Lieut. Col. G. V. Winsom R.E.
Superintending Engineer 2nd Division

To

Colonel C. A. Orr R.E.
Secretary to Government
D. P. O.

Sir

In forwarding a Memo-
revising charges made against Delta
Superintendent Madava Row by his Range
Officer, Lieut. Vibart, and ordering his
dismissal, I have the honor with
reference to para 10 Chapter III Code
of Public Works, to solicit the instructions
of Government as to whether the security
money and its interest, also the pay now
due to the late Delta Superintendent
may be retained, to compensate in part
for the loss caused by him.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Yours most Obedt Servt

Lieut. Winsom R.E.
Superintending Engineer 2nd Division

Sup. Engrs Office
 Memo. Kasulipalaam
 10th August 1865

In his letter No 75 of 30 June, Lt Vibart the Officer in Charge of No 1 Range brings to notice the inaccurate measurements of Delta Superintendent Madavarow employed in widening the Western Bank Channel.

2. This letter having been forwarded to Madavarow in order that he may explain as far as possible the alleged inaccuracies, he has replied at length in a letter dated 10 July 1865.

3. Lt Vibart forwards remarks on the Delta Superintendent's letter in a Memo dated 16 July.

4. I have very carefully read over these documents and fully considered both the charges on one side and the explanations on the other. There is no kind of work which affords a greater opportunity for fraud than that work and therefore it is most necessary that the Executive Officer's orders should be strictly carried out. This Madavarow has clearly not done & has in consequence rendered it impossible

20th Aug/65 No 531-533

20th Aug/65
 No 1 Range
 Lt Vibart
 10th July 1865
 The Deputy Engineer
 (Kasulipalaam)
 The Secretary to Govt
 10th August/65
 Regarding instructions
 as to widening the channel
 by way of the west side
 the flag now due to the late
 Delta Superintendent
 may be referred to Bangalore
 state can start from the left
 (signed by him)

LB

2. 21st August 1865 (R. 2249)

202499-28th August 1865

impossible to verify the breadths of
his cuttings. With regard to the depths,
the statement made by Madava Row
that he measured differently to Vull
Vibart, furnishes insufficient excuse
for if Vull Vibart's method of having
horizontal measurement gives too little in one
case, as in that where the bank slopes
from the lip, it would give the reverse when
the ground slopes to the lip. But Madava
Row's measurements are all in excess, -
all to the disadvantage of the Government
and the profit of the digger, or himself.
This circumstance in itself, is most
suspicious, but I am not of opinion
that actual fraud can be charged
upon him in a Court of law unless it
could be proved that the sums charged
were not paid to the workmen or that
he had again received money from the
Hudders. It is further to be noted that
Vull Vibart's measurements are compared
with the least of Madava Row's, that
the latter has every advantage afforded
him. The deficiency caused by these
mismeasurements is Rs 732-0-0.

5 I further note that this is not

the first time Madava Row has been
accused by his Range Officer. Captain
Hastie found a great deficiency in his
line accounts and Col. Anderson the
then Supt Engineer ordered him to pay
up Rs 480-2-9 the value of Chumans
not accounted for by him. which
Madava Row did and in his Memo
No 297, dated 11th December 1863 on this
matter Col. Anderson stigmatizes the Delta
Superintendent's conduct in the matter as
"very suspicious" and recommends that
in future he should be trusted with
no work which could not be checked
by prompt measurement.

6 I am also aware that Madava
Row's reputation for honesty among the
Officers of the Department has for
long been at a low ebb.

7 Under these circumstances I deem
it my duty to dismiss Delta Supt.
Madava Row from Government employ
and to request the orders of Government
as to whether his deposit of Rs 200
amounting now with interest to Rs 225/
shall be retained as a fraction of the
loss which his inefficiency, if not

dishonesty has caused. Civil Vibart
will be directed also to retain any arrears
of pay now due to Madava Row
until further orders.

Geo. Minicoll V. C. E.
Supt Engineer 2nd Div.

20th Aug 1865

20th Aug 1865

20th Aug 1865
to the Secy to Govt
20th Aug 1865

Public Works Dept

No 2499
Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date 11th 28th August 1865
Read the following

From the Superintending Engineer
of the 2nd Division.

Requesting instructions as
to whether the security money and
its interest also the pay now due (For out 10th August 1865
to the late Delta Supt of Madava-
Row may be retained to compensate
in part for the loss caused by him -

As it appears from the memo.
accompanying this letter that the
Supper that we cannot charge of fraud preferred against
trust the security money Madava Row cannot be subse-
but she has been dis-
pended - her dismissal
should date from the
period of suspension -
I think the rule should be
to dismiss a man against
whom such a case as that
of Madava Row & the
Chunam deficiency has
been proved -

Madava Row has been
dismissed, but whether
after suspension, does not
appear. If her measure
made whilst in the service of Govt -
The 1st Eng 2nd Div
The Controller of the
shown to have been sustained,
20th Sept 29th August

I think the sum placed
in deposit as security, is
clearly liable for each part
of the top and will cover.
If this deposit was to
be returned liable, I doubt
how long it can have been
unusually demanded from
him. If he was sus-
pended as he ought to
have been whilst Leitch
or Barb was testing
his measurements, his
pay should be forfeited
from date of suspending
W.D.

35
Report that of Mr. Leitch