

(1) Number of pages 2.6

(2) Date of repair 12-12-62

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 3081

Press
~~Mis.~~

375-376

Dated 16-6-1865

1865

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
16th October 1865.*

No. 375. Read the following letter from Captain J. GODDARD, R. E., Officiating Superintending Engineer, 4th Division, to Colonel C. A. ORR, R. E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras 29th September 1865, No. 2,025 :—

SIR, In your Office Endorsement dated 18th July 1864, on Parthasarthy Naidoo's Petition, praying for a Memorandum of the charges on which his dismissal was ordered in G. O. No. 473, dated 15th February 1864, the Superintending Engineer of the 4th Division was directed to furnish the Petitioner with papers relating to his case, and to forward to Government any representation the latter may make.

1 Petition dated 13th July 1864, with one enclosure.
1 Paper of Charges against and Defence of Parthasarthy.
1 Letter, No. 56, dated 30th June 1865, with enclosure.

2. This the Overseer has done, and I have now the honor to submit his explanation with other papers bearing on the subject, for the orders of Government.

3. The charges upon which Parthasarthy Naidoo was dismissed appear in paragraphs 12 and 13 of Colonel Boileau's letter, embodied in Proceedings of Government, No. 379, dated 5th February 1864, but they are more particularly detailed in Captain Chrystie's report, where the Overseer's delinquencies are stated to have been perpetrated in connexion with the following four works in the Arcot Taluq, viz., 1, the Kuddapentangle channel; 2, the Nayapaukum to Manapaukum channel; 3, the Maicherry Pallun tank; and 4, the Ramdum Chittary tank.

4. With a view to placing the subject clearly before Government: the charges preferred, Mr. Howard's report thereon, the Overseer's explanation, and Captain Chrystie's observations on the foregoing are given in parallel columns in a separate paper accompanying this letter.

5. Mr. Howard, it will be seen, strongly advocates the Overseer's case, and the explanations of the latter are based on nearly the same grounds as those upon which Mr. Howard exonerates him from blame.

6. The chief argument used in Parthasarthy's favor in the cases of the first three works is, that the Overseer's connexion with those works continued for a very short time only after their commencement, the bills submitted by him being for the first parts of the several works, and as those bills were endorsed in each case by the then Range Officer as having been examined with reference to the work and found correct, the obvious inference is that the frauds which were afterwards detected by Captain Chrystie were committed by the Overseer's successor, whose connexion with the works was of greater duration, and in whose time larger bills had been submitted for each. Mr. Howard asserts this most positively, and I see no reason for differing from him in opinion. It is true Captain Chrystie, in the case of the first work, states that the fraud in the estimate framed by Mr. Erskine was so palpable that it is impossible the Overseer could have failed to detect it; but as Parthasarthy is particularly spoken of in testimonials previously given by Mr. Dopping and Mr. Howard, as being a trustworthy man, while the other certificates bear abundant testimony to his being a good public servant, it is but fair that the reputation gained in a service extending over a period of thirteen years should lend some weight in removing doubts, and tend to acquit him of any share in the fraudulent transactions in connexion with these three works.

7. The Ramdum Chittary tank appears to have been under Parthasarthy's management up to date of completion, and though the measurements taken by Captain Chrystie amount to less than half of those of Parthasarthy, I think it is satisfactorily shown that the deficit in Captain Chrystie's measurements is owing to certain omissions. Captain Chrystie states, in reply to the Overseer's averment, that the tanks under water and the new bund which connects the large and the small tanks had been evidently omitted by that Officer: "The pits for that work must now be measured, and if they do account for it, the Overseer will have satisfactorily explained the matter."

8. Lieutenant Brockman has re-measured the work in accordance with orders from this Office, and his report is enclosed. This Officer's measurements give 4,382 cubic yards of earthwork, while Parthasarathy's estimate allows 6,100, the small difference being attributed to Lieutenant Brockman omitting to measure certain pits which in consequence of their being nearly filled (having been under water for some time) could not be measured with accuracy, and other pits which had been filled by the Ryots for carrying on their cultivation. Lieutenant Brockman gives it as his opinion that if allowance be made for these omissions little or no difference would exist between the work charged for and that executed.

9. No fraud could therefore have been committed in this work, and the charge against Parthasarathy falls to the ground.

10. I think it is conclusively shown that Parthasarathy was not a party to the frauds which were committed in the Arcot Taluq, and as he has borne a good character during his employment under Government for a period of thirteen years, I have no hesitation in recommending him as a deserving object for leniency. His having been mixed up in the matter is due to adventitious circumstances. Fraud having been discovered in some of the works the execution of which he superintended, it was impossible, in the absence of explanation such as that now furnished, to have separated him from the other parties implicated in it. On the whole I am disposed to think that Parthasarathy has made out a fair case for himself, and as the Superintending Engineer never recommended his dismissal, it is presumed he can have no objection to his restoration.

No. 376.

ORDER THEREON, 16th October 1865, No. 3,081.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 31.

1. In January 1864 the Superintending Engineer of the 4th Division brought to notice certain frauds and irregularities which had been systematically practised by subordinates of the Department in the North Arcot District, in connection with works under progress in the Arcot Taluq. One of the men implicated in these frauds was alleged to be C. Parthasarathy Naidoo, then an Overseer in the Coimbatore District, and it having been reported that he had furnished false measurements of four works on which over-payments had been made, his dismissal was ordered in G. O. No. 473, dated 16th February 1864.

2. In July following Parthasarathy Naidoo appealed against this decision. He represented that he was entirely ignorant of the grounds on which he had been found to be connected with the frauds above mentioned, and prayed that he might be furnished with a statement of the charges on which his removal had been ordered.

3. The Superintending Engineer of the 4th Division was accordingly instructed to supply the Petitioner with copies of the papers relating to his case, and to forward to Government any explanation which Parthasarathy might wish to make. This explanation the Officer at present in charge of the 4th Division now submits with the letter above recorded.

4. The works for which Parthasarathy Naidoo was stated to have furnished false measurements are—

- 1st.—The Kuddapentangle channel
- 2nd.—Channel from Nagentangle to Manapaukum
- 3rd.—Maicherry Pallum tank
- 4th.—Ramdum Chittary tank.

5. As respects the first three, Captain Goddard shows that the frauds discovered in connection therewith were in all probability committed by the Overseer who succeeded Parthasarathy in the Arcot Taluq, and not by him; while, with reference to the fourth work, with which he was more entirely connected, it appears from the examination lately made by Lieutenant Brockman, the Assistant Engineer now in charge of the Vellore Range, that little or no difference exists between the

quantities charged for and those actually executed. Captain Goddard consequently gives it as his opinion that Parthasarathy Naidoo is entitled to exculpation from the charges preferred against him, and recommends his restoration to the Department.

6. Under these circumstances, and taking into consideration his previous good service of thirteen years, and the favorable testimony borne to his character by the Officers under whom he was formerly employed, the Government are pleased to declare that there is now nothing to prevent Parthasarathy Naidoo's being re-entered in the Department, and the Superintending Engineers of the 4th and 7th Divisions will be requested to re-appoint him to the first vacancy that may occur in either Division in the grade of Taluq Overseer.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineers, 4th and 7th Divisions.
To the Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Certificates

The Deena Parthasarathy has been under my immediate orders for a considerable time and latterly under the orders of Mr. Ramangollos Pillay. I have always found him qualified for the position of Overseer and had hoped to have seen him promoted before I left the Country. He is well up in masonry works and can survey level neatly and correctly. He is a very fine draughtsman. His accounts have always been found most trustworthy. Give this character and am about to retire to India.

True Copy.

(Signed) J. H. Coffin C.E.
late District Engineer

I was acquainted with Parthasarathy Deena for 3 years 1859 to 1862 while I was District Engineer and he was then been a Sub Overseer, 2^d Class and a very good man of that rank. He can survey and level, and draw ^{very} neatly. His services being dispensed with him. (I hope he may be) appointed a Saluk Overseer.

True Copy.

12th July 1863.

(Signed) H. C. Prudden Capt.

This is to certify that C. Parthasarathy Deena has served under my immediate orders as a Saluk Overseer for the space of 8 months. I found him a very willing hard working man. He understands his work well.

True Copy.

Barrow Range Office
11th April 1864.

Signed E. Wiffen
Superintendent in Charge
of Barrow Range.

From

No 113

Public Range Office
15 July 1863

Mr. Howard Esq.
Deputy Assistant Commissioner
in Charge of the Public Range.

Colonel J. M. Pooleman P. E.
Superintendent, Virginia 1st Division

Sir

I beg leave most respectfully to bring to your notice the very lamentable case of Parthasarathy Naicker late Chief Clerk in the S. P. M. who was thrown out of employment of the new S. P. M.

Parthasarathy entered the Road Department as an Apprentice in 1852, where he served until the latter end of 1855. when he was transferred to the Public Account work and promoted to Sub Overseer in June 1857 on the organization of the Department of S. P. M.

Parthasarathy has since 1859. he has served under my own immediate orders for the period of 3 years as Sub Overseer in Charge of the Highgate Works connected with the Palace Street in the District of Salisbury and I always found him most willing and attentive to his duties, he was well to his work required of him as an Overseer in S. P. M. and to his best of my belief, I am of opinion that Parthasarathy holds as a good, honest, and trustworthy man. He holds good testimonials from his Superior Officers in the S. P. M. (two of which I beg to enclose herewith for your perusal to be kindly returned.) These certificates bear just testimony to Parthasarathy Naicker's work as an Overseer.

Under these circumstances I beg to respectfully that you will be pleased to excuse my addressing you in Parthasarathy Naicker's behalf and that you will take his case into your favorable consideration by giving him the first of Salary Overseer when

when opportunity offers itself for such or something else as a manager in the Amicable Establishment when that same is sanctioned, as I believe him to be well worthy of a better fate than that which has unfortunately fallen to his lot by the reorganization of the Department of Public Works.

(True Copy) I beg to remain

Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
(Sd.) Mr. Howard
Deputy Asst. Commissioner in Charge of the Public Range.

No 1219

Extract from the Proceedings of the Superintending Engineer
14th Division S. P. M. Dated 20th July 1863.

Read the following letter from the Executive Agent V. Range
Here enter dated 15th July 1863. No 113.

Mr. Howard is informed in reply to the above letter that advantage will be taken of any opportunity, that may offer for providing for Parthasarathy in the manner suggested.

2. The Original testimonials received with the above letter have herewith returned in future copies of testimonials only should be forwarded.

(True Extract)

Signed J. Pooleman
Lieut Col. P. E.
Superintending Engineer 14th Division

Certificate

We the undersigned certify

1. That Mr. Supervisor G. E. Wiffin has received from Overseer Parthasarathy, District the sum of Rs. 1000 being the balance of cash in the Revenue hands at this date.
 2. That Mr. Supervisor G. E. Wiffin has received from Overseer C. Parthasarathy, District all the books (Plans and other documents relating to the Daraparam Salan) shown in the register of Office records to be in the Salan Office at this date.
 3. That Mr. Supervisor G. E. Wiffin has received from Overseer C. Parthasarathy, District all the furniture shown in the list return to be in use in the Office.
 4. That Mr. Sup^t G. E. Wiffin has received from Overseer Parthasarathy, District all the Surveying and Mathematical instruments drawing materials & Stationary in the Daraparam Salan Office at this date as shown in the specification.
 5. That Mr. Supervisor G. E. Wiffin has received from Overseer C. Parthasarathy, District all the books in use - have been brought up to the date and examined by use.
- That we have examined the accounts & station books of the principal works in progress and that we have examined the accounts & station books of all the completed works in the Daraparam Salan and found his expenditure on them up to the end of last month agree with the stationing progress and we are satisfied that the work done does not exceed the estimated cost thereof.
- That the tools on survey inspected work have been taken over by Mr. G. E. Wiffin and that he is satisfied that they agree with the returns shown in the accounts of such works.

True Copy
Signed G. E. Wiffin, Supervisor
in Charge of Daraparam

C. Parthasarathy, District Salan
Overseer C. S. S.

9th April 1863

To Col. G. & Gen. P. C.

Secretary to Government D. P. W.
J. J. J.

Most Respected Sir

I beg leave most respectfully to address you these few lines in the humble but confident hope that you will be pleased to take my helpless case into your kind and deliberate consideration and dispense justice to me.

In March last, when I was employed as an Overseer in the Daraparam Salan of the Coimbatore District Mr. Supervisor G. E. Wiffin, in Charge of the Waran Range, furnished me with a Copy of the Proceedings of Government dated 16th February 1864 N^o 473, which directed my dismissal because I was implicated in the frauds and irregularities reported in the letter from the Superintending Engineer 14th Division.

Mr. Wiffin being unable to give me any further information regarding my dismissal than that conveyed in the Proceedings above alluded to I had to come down to Madras.

After my arrival here, I learn that Captain Christie was specially deputed to inquire into and report upon certain irregularities committed by

by Mr. Overseer Corshine and Nannasawun Woodley,
who were employed in the Collier Range, and that the
result of that Officer's investigations brought about
their dismissal as well as mine.

(During Captain & Lytle's investigations; I was not directed to be present to offer my defence, nor was any communication sent to me regarding any of the points under inquiry. To speak the truth, I was not at all aware of Captain & Lytle's proceedings until my arrival at Madison and I really know not in what way I was found to have been connected with the irregularities practised by Mr. Estlin and Pannasawmy Muddelly.

I take this opportunity to bring to your notice that I was employed in the Department of Public Works for the space of 13 years and have obtained several Testimonials of Character from the officers under whom I served, Copies of which are herewith enclosed for your kind perusal.

I beg here to submit that my dismissal from employment is quite opposed to the provisions contained in para 9* of C. M. S. dated 5th May 1880. No 421, for, I again say that Captain Chigote's investigations from the beginning to the end were conducted without my knowledge at a time when I was employed in the Coimbatore District.

Yours most respectfully,
and

and earnestly beg that you will be pleased to cause a
Memorandum to be furnished to me specifying the charge
on which my dismissal has been pronounced and
to allow me an opportunity to appear before Mr Howard
Sub Engineer in charge of the Yellow Range, or before
Captain Christie and disprove every one of them.

I have nothing more to add than to leave
 the favor of your kindly complying with my prayer
 which I consider the only proper as unreasonable in the
 case of a Public Servant of my description, whose
 character and position in life have been affected by
 this compulsory non employment.
 I beg to remain
 Most Respectfully

Linda Abbott
 Amy Kaituma
 Room No. 36
 13th July 1864

Yours most Obedient & Humble Servant
C. Parthasarathy Aiyar Esq.
Cousin of Mr

[Faint handwritten notes, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.]

N^o 2025. Superintg Engrs Office S. Divn
Madras 29th September 1865.

From
Captain J. Coadard Rb
Offg. Supg. Engineer S. Divn

To
Colonel C. A. Orr Rb
Secretary to Government M.D.

Sir.

In your office endorsement dated 15th July 1864 on Parthasarthy Naikin's petition praying for a memorandum of the charges on which his dismissal was ordered in S. O. N^o 473 dated 15th February 1864, the Superintending Engineer of the S. Division was directed to furnish the petitioner with papers relating to his case and to forward to Government any representation the latter may make.

This the Oversee has done and I have, now the honor to submit his explanation with other papers bearing on the subject for the orders of Government.

The charges upon which Parthasarthy Naikin was dismissed appear in paras 12 & 13 of Colonel Birkens letter embodied in Proceedings of Government N^o 379 dated 5th February 1864, but they are more particularly detailed in Captain Wrythes report where the Oversee

22/9/1864 Engrs

11/10/1864 Engrs

11/10/1864 Engrs

21/10/1864 Engrs

21/10/1864 Engrs

Resolving the
furnished with a memo
regarding the charges on
which his dismissal was
ordered.

21/10/1864 Engrs

Copy to Collector.

Referred to the Superintending Engineer S. Division with a request that the Collector may be furnished with copies of the papers relating to his case.

Any representation that the Collector may wish to make should be submitted to Government through the Superintending Engineer.

Wm. Henry Maynard Esq.
By Secretary to Govt

Overseer's delinquencies are stated to have been perpetrated in connexion with the following four works in the Arcot taluk viz 1. the Kuddapentangle Channel, 2. the Mayapantham to Manapantham Channel, 3. the Mai-cherry Pallam Land B and 4. the Pan-dum Chittany Land B.

4. With a view to placing the subject clearly before Government, the charges preferred, Mr Howard's report thereon, the Overseer's explanation and Captain Chrystie's observations are the foregoing are given in parallel columns in a separate paper accompanying this letter.

5. Mr Howard, it will be seen, strongly advocates the Overseer's case and the explanations of the latter are based on nearly the same grounds as those upon which Mr Howard incriminates him from blame.

6. The chief argument used in Parthasarthy's favor in the cases of the first three works is that the Overseer's connexion with those works continued for a very short time only after their commencement, the bills submitted by him being for the first parts of the several works, and as those bills were endorsed in each case by the then Range Officer as having been examined with reference to the work and found correct.

Correct, the obvious inference is that the frauds which were afterwards detected by Captain Chrystie were committed by the Overseer's successor whose connexion with the work was of greater duration and in whose time larger bills had been submitted for each. Mr Howard assents to this most positively and I see no reason for differing from him in opinion. It is true Captain Chrystie in the case of the first work states that the fraud in the estimate framed by Mr Crispine was so palpable that it is impossible the Overseer could have failed to detect it, but as Parthasarthy is particularly spoken of in testimonials previously given by Mr Dopping and Mr Howard as being a trustworthy man while the other testimonials bear abundant testimony to his being a good public servant, it is but fair that the reputation gained in a service extending over a period of 13 years should bear some weight in removing doubts and tend to acquit him of any share in the fraudulent transactions in connexion with these three works.

7. The Pandum Chittany Land B appears to have been under Parthasarthy's management up to date of completion and though the measurements taken by Captain

Captain Chrystie amount to less than half of those of Parthasarthy; I think it is satisfactorily shown that the defect in Captain Chrystie's measurements is owing to certain omissions. Captain Chrystie states in reply to the Overseer's question that the tanks under water and the new bund which connects the large and the small tanks had been evidently omitted by that officer. "The pits for that work must now be measured and if they do account for it the Overseer will have satisfactorily explained the matter."

8. Lieutenant Brockman has re-measured the work in accordance with orders from this Office and his report is enclosed: His officer's measurements give 4382 Cubic Yards of earthwork while Parthasarthy estimates allows 6100. The small difference being attributed to Lieutenant Brockman omitting to measure certain pits which in consequence of their being nearly filled (having been under water for some time) could not be measured with accuracy and other pits which had been filled by the ryots for carrying on their cultivation. Lieutenant Brockman gives it as his opinion that if allowance be

153
be made for these omissions little or no difference would exist between the work charged for and that executed.

9. No fraud could therefore have been committed in this work and the charge against Parthasarthy falls to the ground.

10. I think it is conclusively shown that Parthasarthy was not a party to the fraud which were committed in the erecting and as he has borne a good character during his employment under Government for a period of 13 years I have no hesitation in recommending him as a deserving object for leniency. His having been mixed up in the matter is due to adventitious circumstances.

Fraud having been discovered in some of the works the execution of which he superintended, it was impossible in the absence of explanation such as that now furnished to have separated him from the other parties implicated in it. On the whole I am disposed to think that Parthasarthy has made out a fair case for himself and as the Superintending Engineer never

recommended

recommended his dismissal if it is pre-
sumed he can have no objection to
his restoration. —

I have the honor to be
Sir.

Your most Obedt Servant

Thos. P. Wood Captain R. E.
Offg. Superintendent of Engineers & Dr.

2/7/90

Public Works Department

No 3081

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the 16th October 1865

Read the following

From the officiating Dy. Engineer
of the 4th Division

Submitting for the consideration
of the late Engineer Public
Works Department explanation
on the charges brought home
against him.

(Here enter 29th September 1865 or 2025)

In January 1864 the Dy. Engineer of the 4th Division brought to notice certain frauds and irregularities which had been systematically practised by Subordinates of the Department in the North Arcot District in connection with works under progress in the Arcot Talook. One of the men implicated in these frauds was alleged to be P. Parthasarthy Naidoo, then an Overseer in the Tirumalpet District, and it having been reported that he had furnished false measurements of four works on which over-
-payments

JP
WOM

D. M. 1865
Pro. of Engrs. & Public Works
Dept. of Madras Govt.
(1865)

The Officiating
Dy. Engineer of the 4th Division

To the Secretary
to Government

Dated 29th Sept 1865
at Calcutta

B. A. 1025

Substituted by
Naidoo (late Overseer
of the 4th Division) on
the charges brought home
against him

10075

e. 5m 3081/65

2025 3081-164 B. A. 1025

= payments had been made, his
dismissal was ordered in G. O.
No 473 dated 16th February.

In July following Parthasarthy
Naidoo. appealed against this
decision. He represented that
he was entirely ignorant of
the grounds on which he had
been found to be connected
with the frauds above mentioned,
and prayed that he might be
furnished with a statement
of the charges on which his re-
= moval had been ordered.

The Supt Engineer of the
4th Division was accordingly in-
structed to supply the Petitioner
with copies of the papers re-
lating to his case, and to
forward to Government any
Explanation which Parthasarthy
might wish to make. This
Explanation the Officer at
present in charge of the 4th
Division now submits with
the ~~former~~ ^{letter} above recorded.

The works for which Par-
thasarthy Naidoo was stated
to have furnished false
measurements are -

- 1st The Veddapentangle Channel -
- 2nd Channel from Nayentangle
to Manapankun -
- 3rd Maichery Cullene Tank

4th Kandam Pillaiy Tank

As respects the first three
Captain Goddard shows that
the frauds discovered in the
section therein were in all
probability committed by the
Meesur who succeeded Parthasarthy
in the Arest Talook, and not
by him; while, with reference to
the fourth work with which he
was more entirely connected,
it appears from the Examination
recently made by Lieut Brockman
the Aft Engineer now in charge
of the Vellor Range, that little
or no difference exists between
the quantities charged for and
those actually executed - Capt
Goddard consequently gives it
as his opinion that Parthasarthy
Naidoo is entitled to exculpation
from the charges preferred against
him, and recommends his re-
= storation to the Department

Under these circumstances
and taking into consideration
his previous good service of
13 years, and the favourable
testimony borne to his character
by the Officers under whom
he was formerly employed,
the Government are pleased
to declare that there is

now nothing to prevent Perkins
Naidoo being re-entertained
in the Department (Lapang)
~~James has been discharged~~
~~for a long time~~

and the Sup-Engineers of
the 4th and 7th Divisions will
be requested to re-appoint
him to the first vacancy that
may occur in either Division in the
file of Colock Messer —
(15)

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly a list or notes.]

[Handwritten initials or signature, possibly "A.P."]

[Handwritten signature, possibly "John..."]

[Handwritten signature, possibly "H. H. ..."]
To the Sup-Engineers 4-7-77
The Controller of P.W. Accounts

N^o 375-376

28 Decr 17th October

70/7 1865 Depo
of Pro. of Govt. for Oct

N. 3087

Pro. of Govt.

2/16 Oct/65

Parthaswathy Naidoo
late Salary Overseer in Free
District. Authority granted
for the re-entertainment of
and the Superintending Ingr
4th and 7th Divisions requested
to appoint him to the District
or that may occur in either
Division in the grade of Salary
Overseer.