M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 2089	Press / Mis.
3rd Col	
Dated 28-10-	1897.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following letters :—

No. 599. From the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 10th April 1869, No. 115.

1 Letter from Executive Engineer, No. 3 Range, Godavery, No. 283, dated 20th March 1869.
1 Endorsement, with its enclosures.
* Re-transmitted with enclosures.

ADVERTING to your endorsement* on the petition of V. Ramasawmy, late a Talook Overseer's Writer in No. 3 Range, Godavery District, I have the honour to forward, in original, a letter from the Executive Engineer in charge of that Range, from which it will be observed that the Writer had actually altered the figures in the Talook Overseer's Cash and Station Books, of previous payments made to coolies, and thereby exhibited an incorrect balance of cash in Talook Overseer Bay's cash balance statement for July 1868. Under the circumstances reported by Mr. Rundall it was deemed necessary to dismiss the Talook Overseer's Writer.

No. 600. From the Acting Superintending Engineer, 1st Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 5th June 1869, No. 966.

WITH reference to your endorsement of the 5th ultimo on the petition of the late Talook Overseer's Writer V. Ramasawmy and the papers* therewith connected, I have the honour to forward a further report on the facts of the case, received from the Officer in charge of the No. 3 Range, Godavery, accompanied by an explanatory letter from Talook Overseer Bay of the circumstances which led to his making certain corrections in the rough petition of the Writer.

* Herewith returned.

1 Original petition, with translation and Government endorsement.
1 Do. addressed to Captain Ryves, R. E.
1 Do. with Mr. Rundall's original Memorandum, No. 366, dated 21st August 1867, and a rough petition to Mr. Rundall, together with an endorsement from Government.
1 Original letter from Mr. Rundall.
1 Do. to Government, No. 115, dated 10th April 1868.
1 Do. from Mr. Rundall, No. 220, dated 31st May 1867.
1 Do. explanatory letter from Overseer Bay, No. 18, dated 26th May 1869.

2. I quite concur in the opinion expressed by Mr. Rundall, that the fact of Mr. Bay having corrected the draft copy of his Writer's petition is no proof of the Petitioner's statement that the alterations in the accounts prepared by him were not wilfully made, but had occurred through great pressure of work, or that Mr. Bay sanctioned the alterations.

3. Mr. Bay will be warned not to assist in any way any subordinate whose conduct he has had to bring to unfavorable notice.

No. 601. ORDER THEREON, 28th June 1869, No. 2,087.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 78.

IT appears from these papers that V. Ramasawmy, who was employed as a Writer under Mr. Bay, a Talook Overseer

in No. 3 Range of the Godavery District, was dismissed under the following circumstances.

2. In July 1867 Ramasawmy, having brought to Mr. Bay's notice a difference of 1 Rupee which he had discovered when writing up the Cash Book, was instructed to charge the amount to the Naggipudi channel, Mr. Bay having paid that amount for a rope but omitted to enter it in his accounts. The Overseer asserts that he directed the Writer to debit "materials" while the latter debiting "labour" made certain alterations in the accounts. Mr. Bay does not seem to have taken care to see that the debit was properly made, and the Range Officer, viewing the alterations in the light of a falsification of accounts, directed the Writer's dismissal, which was subsequently confirmed by the Superintending Engineer. Ramasawmy is further reported to have also charged the accounts of another work with the rupee in question, but this is not urged as a ground for his dismissal.

3. On a careful consideration of the case, the Government, looking to the insignificance of the amount involved, to the circumstances under which its entry in the accounts was erroneously made, and to the fact of the Writer's immediate superior having thought so lightly of the matter as to have lent the Writer assistance in preparing his explanations of it, see no reason to believe that fraud was intended or, at the most, that anything more than carelessness can be imputed. Ramasawmy has served for upwards of twenty years, and the Government are not of opinion that the irregularity he committed in making a wrong entry in his Station Book under a misapprehension of the orders he had received from his superior can justly be visited upon him so heavily as by dismissal from the public service. His Excellency the Governor in Council therefore resolves to request the Superintending Engineer to make arrangements for restoring him to his former situation, or for providing him with a post of equal emolument elsewhere.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division.

Ed. S. T. Augustin.

Supg. Engrs. Office, 1st Dn.
Dowlaiswaram
10th April 1869

No. 115

From

Captain J. G. Rymer R.E.
Supg. Engineer 1st Dn.

To

Colonel L. A. Orr R.E.
Secretary to Govt. W.P.W.
Madras

Sir,

× retransmitted with enclosures.

Adverting to your Endorsement× on the Petition of V. Ramaswamy late a Taluq Overseer's Writer in the No. 3 Range, Godavery District, I have the honor to forward in Original a letter from the Executive Engineer in Charge of that Range from which it will be observed that the Writer had actually altered the figures, in the Taluq Overseer's Cash and Station Books, of previous payments made to Coolies, and thereby exhibited an incorrect balance of Cash in Taluq Overseer Bay's Cash balance Statement for July 1868. Under the circumstances reported by Mr. Rundall it was deemed necessary to dismiss the Taluq Overseer's Writer.

I have &c &c &c
J. G. Rymer
Capt. R.E.
Supg. Engineer 1st Division

in No. 3 Range of the Godavery District, was dismissed under the following circumstances.

2. In July 1867 Ramasawmy, having brought to Mr. Bay's notice a difference of 1 Rupee which he had discovered when writing up the Cash Book, was instructed to charge the amount to the Naggipudi channel, Mr. Bay having paid that amount for a rope but omitted to enter it in his accounts. The Overseer asserts that he directed the Writer to debit "materials" while the latter debiting "labour" made certain alterations in the accounts. Mr. Bay does not seem to have taken care to see that the debit was properly made, and the Range Officer, viewing the alterations in the light of a falsification of accounts, directed the Writer's dismissal, which was subsequently confirmed by the Superintending Engineer. Ramasawmy is further reported to have also charged the accounts of another work with the rupee in question, but this is not urged as a ground for his dismissal.

3. On a careful consideration of the case, the Government, looking to the insignificance of the amount involved, to the circumstances under which its entry in the accounts was erroneously made, and to the fact of the Writer's immediate superior having thought so lightly of the matter as to have lent the Writer assistance in preparing his explanations of it, see no reason to believe that fraud was intended or, at the most, that anything more than carelessness can be imputed. Ramasawmy has served for upwards of twenty years, and the Government are not of opinion that the irregularity he committed in making a wrong entry in his Station Book under a misapprehension of the orders he had received from his superior can justly be visited upon him so heavily as by dismissal from the public service. His Excellency the Governor in Council therefore resolves to request the Superintending Engineer to make arrangements for restoring him to his former situation, or for providing him with a post of equal emolument elsewhere.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 1st Division.

Exd. S. T. Augustin.

Supt. Engr. 1st Div.
Dowlaiswaram
13th April 1869

No. 115

From

Captain J. G. Rymer R.E.
Supt. Engineer 1st Div.

To

Colonel L. A. Orr R.E.
Secretary to Govt. P.W.D.
Madras

Sir,

× re transmitted with enclosures.

Adverting to your Endorsement on the Petition of V. Ramaswamy late a Taluq overseer's Writer in the No. 3 Range, Godavery District, I have the honor to forward in original a letter from the Executive Engineer in Charge of that Range from which it will be observed that the Writer had actually altered the figures, in the Taluq Overseer's Cash and Station Books, of previous payments made to Coolies, and thereby exhibited an incorrect balance of Cash in Taluq overseer Bay's Cash balance Statement for July 1868. Under the circumstances reported by Mr. Rundall it was deemed necessary to dismiss the Taluq Overseer's Writer.

I have &c &c &c

J. G. Rymer Capt. R.E.
Supt. Engineer 1st Division

Fort St George
5th May 1869

These papers will be returned to the Supt Engineer of the 1st Divn with a view to his making full enquiry into the circumstances attending the alteration of his accounts by the Petitioner. Capt. Rypes' report on the subject having been written without the light thrown on the matter by the rough draft of the petitioner's letter to the Range Officer under date the 21st August 1865 in which it is clearly shown that the Taluq Overseer was cognizant of the alterations in question.

Fort St George
5th May 1869

Lt Col. R.E.
Secretary to Govt. P.W.D.

Berhampore

Petn of [illegible]
Dated 12th Dec 1865
Received [illegible]
No 115

A. 1865-28 Lr dated 5 Dec 1865 from the Secretary to Govt P.W.D. forwarding the original petition of [illegible] Range of Western Delta

Report by Capt Rype Exr

Letter Superintending Engr dated 7th Feb 1866 with enclosures

Letter to Govt dated 7th March 1866

Copy

Abstract

No 30 or Western Delta Range Coy
Narsapur 20th March 1867

No 283

From The Officer in charge
No 30 or W. D. Range

To, The Superintending Engineer
1st Division

Sir, With reference to your Memo
No 1641 dated the 10th (received on the 18th)
calling upon me to report further
regarding each of the facts which induced
me to recommend the dismissal
of Taluk Overseer's writer V. Ramaswamy
in August 1867, and with reference
to that Individuals petition to Government,
I beg to state that when the Station Books
for works for July 1867 were examined
in my Office, some descrepancies
between the Cash and Station Books
were found to exist. I therefore sent
for the Overseer Mr. Bay and his Writer
and found that the Statement of
Cash Balance at the end of July
had been sent in before the Cash Book
was written up and closed; the Balance
having been shown as Rs 22-5-5 instead

of

of Rs 23.5.5 which was the correct Balance according to a Memo given by the Overseer to the Writer. The error of one Rupee was discovered when the Cash Book was written up, and on the writer bringing it to the notice of the Overseer, Mr Bay states that he told the writer to charge off one Rupee for Rope for Nessipudi Channel as he had given that sum to his Lascar to purchase Rope, and had omitted to enter it. It happened that I knew previously and independently of this Rupee having been given for when inspecting the Nessipudi Channel, I had complained of the Banks not being sectioned for the Bantadars to work to, and the Overseer replied that he had given his Lascar money to purchase rope for that purpose. The writer's statement was that the Overseer simply told him to charge off the Rupee. What the writer did was to alter in the Cash Book, the amount of payment under date the 29th July in Estimate for repairing old Palkole Channel from Rs 11.2.3 to Rs 12.2.3, the alteration of figures being quite clear in the Original Cash Book.

Apparently forgetting that the Cash Book had been altered as above shown, the writer alters in Station Book Mr Bay's figures of number and payment to Coolies on Nessipudi Channel under date 20 July from 96 Coolies at 2 Annas to 104 Coolies, and the amount from Rs 12.0.0 to Rs 13. This could not be a mistake said to arise from the hurry of business. The original figures in the Station Book are Mr Bay's, and the alterations his writer's and the alterations are not initialled by the Overseer. Having told the writer to make a certain charge, I consider=ed that the Overseer was to blame for not having seen it correctly done, but I did not, and do not suppose that Mr Bay would sanction a deliberate alteration of his accounts. The mistake of originally reporting a wrong Cash Balance was the Overseer's, but I considered that the man who knowingly altered the numbers & amounts of payments to coolies was unfit for the post of

of Overseer's writer and accordingly recommended his dismissal.

It was not as the writer's petition would lead one to suppose that because a Rupee had been charged twice over that I considered him worthy of ~~his~~ dismissal, but because he altered the numbers and figures of previous payments that I looked upon him as guilty of falsifying the accounts.

I trust the above will give you the information you desire with reference to Ramaswamy's petition to Government.

The papers returned with your Memo under reply are herewith retransmitted.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most obedt Servt
J W Randall
Executive Engineer No 3 Range

15 March Ramaswamy claims
wishes that because the overs

Gl No 64

From

The Officer in charge
No 3 or Western Delta
Range

To

The Superintending
Engineer 1st Division

Dated 20th } March 1869
Received 7 } 4-69

Encls 4
No 283

Submits information
Regarding the dismissal
of Taluq Overseer's Mukr
v. Ramaswamy.

P.W. 1682/69.

Proc: 28th June 69 Ln Le 600

69/7972 Bl

Encls 8.
1/ Original petition with translation & Govt Endorsement
2/ Copies of Rymes 12 & 13
3/ Original memo No 366/21 August 67
4/ with Mr Rundall's official memo No 366/21 August 67
5/ Original letter from Mr Rundall to the Collr with all enclosures
6/ A rough petition in Tamil from Ramaswami
7/ Original letter from Mr Rundall to the Collr No 115 dated 10th March 1868.
8/ Govt Lr No 600 dated 28th June 1869.

No 220

Western Delta Range
Narsapur 31st May 1869

To

The Superintending Engineer
1st Division

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your memo No 703 returning my previous report regarding the dismissal of V. Ramaswami, together with a second petition from this man and a memo directing further enquiries to be made, as a further light has been thrown on the subject by Ramaswami's second petition.

In addition I have nothing further to the facts as already stated in my letter No 283 of the 20 March.

In his last petition dated 15 March Ramaswami claims to show that because the Over-

last corrected the draft of his petition to me, therefore the Overseer was cognizant of the alterations & falsifications made by the Writer.

On receipt of your memo under reply I called upon Mr Bary to state in writing whether he was or was not cognizant of the alterations made by the Writer & I beg to enclose his reply for your perusal.

Mr. Bay's statement as to Ramswamy being a very slow man is correct, & tho he worked to the late hours he stated he did, it was due principally to his own slowness. Hurry in the preparation of accounts might be an excuse for wrong totals, or wrong calculations, but not for adding

2 Weighbars me from Govt - No 47 dt 5th May 1869 & the rotter thereon &c
No 354 dated 29th April 1869.
1 Copy of Official memo No 630 dt 28th August 1867 sent to V. Ramaswamy.
1 enclosure No 18 dt 25th May 1869 from Mr. Bay on receipt of Ramaswamy's

in Cutchis who were never employed.

The fact of the overseer correcting Ramswamy's draft can hardly, I should say, be made to support the writer's statement that Mr Bay sanctioned the alterations, which in this very petition to me are admitted the Writer to have been made by himself.

In conclusion I beg to state that Ramswamy was appointed Talook overseer by me on perusal of his character and had I not considered that nothing could excuse the deliberate alterations of accounts by him I should not have recommended his dismissal.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servt
J W Ruxton
Asst

No 354 Memo

As a full report on the case of V. Ramaswami Cate Palug writer in the No 3 or Western Delta Range was submitted by Captain Ryves on the 10th April 169 the enclosed papers are herewith returned

Wm. T. Kitson Captain R.E.
Ag. Superintending Engr. 1st Div.

To
The Secretary to Government
P. W.D. with reference to his en=
=dorsement No 803 of 15th April 169

29. april 169
Dowl m

From The Officiating
No. 3 Range
To The Superintending
Engineer 1st Div.

Dated 31st March 1869.
Received
No 220

Submits clerk
information
the dismissal
Ramaswamy
Surveyor
Tanjore
Dated 1st June 69

with returned
enclosures 10-
request Solicitor
transmission
Government
Government
adopted by
Division

No 966 Superintending Engineer's Office 1st Div.
Cowlaiswarum 5th June 1869.

To

Captain J. J. Fischer R.E.
Acting Superintending Engineer
1st Division

To

Colonel C. A. Orr R.E.
Secretary to Government
P. S. W. Madras

Sir.

With reference to your endorsement
of the 5th Ultimo on the Petition of the
late Taluq Overseer's Writer V. Rama-
swamy, and the papers therewith connect-
ed. I have the honor to forward a re-
further report on the facts of the case,
received from the Officer in charge
of the No. 3 Range Godavery in
accompanied by an explanatory letter

from

with returned

from Taking Overseer in Bay. of the circumstances which led to his making certain corrections in the rough Petition of the Writer.

2. I quite concur in the Opinion expressed by Mr. Randall that the fact of Mr. Bay having corrected the draft Copy of the writers Petition is no proof of the Petitioner's Statement that the alterations in the accounts prepared by him were not wilfully made but had occurred through great pressure of work, or that Mr. Bay sanctioned the alterations.

3. Mr. Bay will be warned not to assist in any way any Subordinate whose conduct he has had to bring to unfavorable notice.

I have &c.

W. H. Hoskyn Captain R.E.

Acting Supt. Engineer 1st Div.

A.L.

No 1856 Dept
Public Works Revenue
(Irrign) No 2464

Recd by Supt Engineer
1st Dec

To The Secretary to Govt of M
Madras

Dated 5th
Desp 7th
Rec'd 14th
} Irrign.

Enclosures 10

Forwarding the petition of late Taluq Overseer Master V. Ramaswamy with papers thereinwith connected for disposal.

No 2087. 28th June/69

Ack 6od
14th June/69. Rl. 21st

No 78

J. W. Randall Esqre
Exc Engineer

Sir.

With reference to your Memo No 160 with the enclosures herewith returned, I respectfully beg leave to report that at the Range Office on the 19th August (as all the Books relating to this subject are at the Overseer's Office at Pattikole this is written entirely from memory) I Explained how I paid Lazer a Rupee for rope and ordered Ramaswamy to debit the Public Works a Sluice & Cutting a Channel at Veggakudy. After the Cash account for July was closed I found I had a rupee less than my balance per Account, and on examining the book I found that the rupee I had given the Lazer was not entered, I showed this to Ramaswamy & ordered the entry to be made in the Cash Account at once. Either by set over the job quick or through forgetfulness he Entered the sum as paid for 8 Coolies @ 2 annas instead of for Materials Cor rope, in the Cash book; And in Station Bks of two works then in progress in

No 78

J. W. Randall Esqre
Exc Engineer

Sir.

With reference to your Memo No 160 with the enclosures herewith returned, I respectfully beg leave to report that at the Range Office on the 19th August (as all the Correspondence and duplicate Station Books relating to this subject are at the Overseer's Office at Palkole this is written entirely from memory) I explained how I paid Lazer Bapana a rupee for rope and ordered Ramaswamy to debit the Public Contractors a Slice & Cutting a Channel at Iregapady. After the Cash account for July was closed I found I had a rupee less than my balance per Account, and on examining the book I found that the rupee I had given the Lazer was not entered, I showed this to Ramaswamy & ordered the Entry to be made in the Cash Account at once. Either to get over the job quick or through forgetfulness he entered the sum as paid to 8 Coolies @ 2 annas instead of to Materials Coir rope, in the Cash book; And in Station Books of two works then in progress in

No 2087. 28th June/69

No 600
19th June/69. Rx. 21st

P.W. 1869 Dept
Dte of Govt for issue
From) No 2464
The Secy Supt Engineer
1st Dist

To The Secretary
to Govt Dept W
Madras

Dated 5th
Dispd 7th
Rec'd 14th } June 69.

Enclosures 10

Forwarding the petition of late Tahsildar Ameers Master V. Ramaswamy with papers thereinwith connected for disposal.

Confusion at the moment he made the same false entry of Labor for Materials. I did not know that Ramaswamy had made these false entries in the accounts until I was shewn it at the Range Office.

When you questioned me about this at the Range Office I told you that rope was paid for, not 8 coolies, with this rupee and that the entry had been wrongly made by the writer; this statement against him, made in his presence was not denied then; nor does he, in his petitions of the 21st August, and 15th March 69, say that he did not know rope was purchased for Rs on the ch: with the rupee, and on keeping silent throughout on the gravest charge against himself he admits it.

He pleads that "these mistakes occur for want of proper time". He is an exceedingly slow man at all his work, and was once fined for inactivity. He used to keep his papers to very late hours or I should not have noted it in his petition, and still he required the assistance of the road Gomasta to get the Station Books ready by the 6th of every month. If the Cash Book was closed by him in time I would have had no reasons for despatching my cash balance statement, before my cash accounts was tested by the balance in hand.

In September 67 I made a payment on the Rapalka Bridge, after examining the muster roll myself and finding it correct, at the same time I made the entry into the Cash Book. Ramaswamy in preparing the Station Book of that work from the daily reports omitted a Mason @ 7annas a unit to make out that I overpaid 7annas, I was sure that it was not so because I examined the batwada papers myself, & I gave him the batwada papers and ordered him to check the Station Book. He went to the office and gave what he was ordered to do, & the Road Gomasta brought me the Station book late in the evening and told me that the muster roll and my cash book entry was correct and that he had corrected the Station book, and finding the total payment in the Station Book agreeing with the total payment as per Cash book, I initialed the total altered, After I returned from the Range Office and compared the muster rolls with the Station book myself, I then found out that the road Gomasta, to make quick work of what I ordered Ramaswamy to do, does not compose in

257

the Station book with the Rotwada papers but adds to the Station book (3½ coolies @ 2 annas, or 2 coolies @ 3½ as I do not exactly recollect) & makes up the difference of 7 annas -

What does Ramaswamy say about this?

"I gave the Rapatka Station Book & the Varavaraud Road Sonsta to examine, he examined it badly" (he did not examine it at all) "and found a difference of 7 annas & the total account which he told me and I informed Mr Bay Jr. ..... I did not see the Station book nor examine it again for want of time" vide petition.

I knew that the station book total of cash payment was first wrong being minus of 7 annas and that afterwards that total had been altered to agree with the actual expenditure, but I believed this was done after really comparing the station book with the muster roll and daily reports, and after the real error had been detected; not by falsely entering a few coolies for a mason that was omitted.

As Ramaswamy was a writer under me, his petition was sent by me to you. I did not say a word for or against any of his statements - because I had already given you a full explanation first, verbally at the Range Office and again when sending you the muster roll of the Rapatka Anicut -

Ramaswamy brought his rough petition to me to correct I read it, and where a score of corrections could have been made I only made a few that were necessary in order that the petition be intelligible, for instance "Since your honor appointed me as Taliaty writer Jr..." without the pronoun me in this sentence the sense would be ambiguous - If I had not made the second correction the petitioner would be understood to complain of sickness and not hard work -

I certainly made no alterations in any of his statements but simply enabled you to understand what the petitioner wished to state - this certainty is not admitting all his misstatements in defence of his wanton carelessness, nor is it any proof that the corrections or alterations in the accounts were made according to my orders" If my orders were carefully attended

To be enabled [illegible] prepared
his Accounts correctly and
not, in order to get over the
work quickly, falsified the
Station Books.

I have the honor to remain
Sir
Your Obedient Servant
E. Bayne
Overseer

A Revd
26/3/69

Cuddalore

Dy Sy Dept

No 2087 2087

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Under date the 28th June 1869
From the Supg Engineer 1st Dn
From the Ag Supg Engineer
1st Dn

Read the following
Received No 115 of 10 April 1869
Forwarded No 966 of 5th
June 1869

Not

It appears from these
papers that V. Ramaswamy,
who was employed as a
Salug Overseer in No 3 Range
of the Southern District,
was dismissed under the
following circumstances.

In July 1867 Ramaswamy
having brought to Mr Bayne
notice a difference of
one Rupee which he had
discovered when writing
up the Cash book, was
in

instructed to charge the amount to the Naggi-
Mr. Bay having paid that amount by mistake, but omitted to enter it in his accounts.
pudi channel, & the Overseer asserts that he directed the writer to debit "materials" while the latter debiting "labor" made certain alterations in the accounts. Mr. Bay does not seem to have taken care to see that the debit was properly made, and the Range Officer, viewing the alterations in the light of a falsification of accounts, directed the writer's dismissal, which was subsequently confirmed by the Superintending Engineer. Ramaswamy is further reported to have also charged the accounts of another work with the one Rupee in question, but this is not urged as a ground for his dismissal.

On a careful consideration of the case, the Government, looking to the insignificance of the amount involved, to the circumstances under which its entry in the accounts was erroneously made, and to the fact of the writer's immediate superior having thought so lightly of the matter as to have lent the writer assistance in preparing his explanations of it, see no reason to believe that fraud was intended

11

or at the most that any-
thing more than care-
lessness can be imputed.
Ramsay has served
for upwards of 20 years
and the Govt. are not of
opinion that the irregularity
he committed in making
a wrong entry in his
Station book under a
misapprehension of the
orders he had received
from his superior. can
justly be visited upon
him so heavily as by
dismissal from the
Public Service. His
Excellency the Governor
in Council therefore re-
solves to request the

Supt Engineer to make
arrangements for res-
toring him to his former
situation or for providing
him with a post of
equal Emolument
Elsewhere.

To The Supt. Engineer
1st Division

Dept. 29/6/69.

Sig Engrs. Asst Sec.
Petition Dept. 30/6/69.

Rec 1582 x 2464

Govt. of {1869} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Superintending Engr.
1st Division

Dated

Recd. Encl. 4

G. O. 25 June 1869, No. 2087

Nos. 599 & 601

Ramasawmy. V. the Supdg Engr
of the 1st Dy requesting bonable
arrangements for restoring V. Ra-
masawmy to his former situation
of Writer under the Taluq Off.
Bay of the 3 Range Godavery Dy
or for providing him with a
post of equal emolument. Else-
where.