

(1) Number of pages 46(2) Date of repair 6-6-44

(3) Initials of the Referee

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 1683

391-79

Dated 2.6.44

Press

Mis

18.5.44

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
22nd June 1871.*

Read the following papers.—

No. 397. From S. PARTHASARTHY NAIDOO, late Talook Overseer, Nellore District.

(Here enter dated 28th April 1871)

No. 398. From the Superintending Engineer, 2nd Division.
(Here enter dated 27th May 1871)

No. 399. ORDER THEREON, 22nd June 1871, No. 1,683.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 51

It appears that the petitioner who was employed as a Talook Overseer in the Nellore District was dismissed from the 31st May 1870 on a strong suspicion of dishonesty, his habits of drunkenness, falsehood, and disobedience of orders; and his petition to be reinstated is dated 28th April 1871. The whole of the circumstances have been fully enquired into, and the result leaves no room for doubt that the petitioner was unfitted for the post he held and was properly dismissed. It further appears that in the quarterly returns immediately preceding his dismissal, namely, in October 1869 and January 1870, the petitioner was unfavourably reported on; and the Government cannot sanction his re-employment in the department.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 2nd Division.
To S. Parthasarthi Naidoo.

Exd. S. T. Augustin

To
Colonel J. Carpendale, R. E.

Chief Engineer & Secretary to Government

Public Works Department

Fort St. George

The humble Memorial respectfully
submitted by S. Parthasarathy Aiyar
late Salar Engineer of Kallare Salar in
the Public Works Department employed
under the orders of Major A. D. Clay
the Executive Engineer in charge of the
Kallare Range, Kallare District.

Most Respectfully, Sir,
Your Petitioner, after studying in the
Civil Engineering College and obtaining a Certificate of
Proficiency, was first entertained in the Department of
Public Works on the 28th July 1866 as Salar Engineer in the
Kallare District, where he continued in the same duty
for some years and latterly was attached to N. S. Kallare
Range, and was placed in charge of the Pannier Delta Work
Range. Your Petitioner continued to perform
his duties with zeal and efficiency and to the entire
satisfaction of all the officers he has served, until
May 1870, when Your Petitioner, all on a sudden and to
his utter astonishment was found fault with by the
Range Officer and was suspended from duty and finally
dismissed, owing to the plots and intrigues of the Police
Inspector Mr. Reason as will be shown below.
Mr. Reason, the Police Inspector, applied
to Your Petitioner for some Calmirah trees to build his
bungalow and not obtaining a compliance with his
request as will be seen from the accompanying copies
of

At his Communications marked 1, entertained malicious feelings and grudge against your Petitioner, and gradually worked to take possession of Major Clay's mind and create suspicion against your Petitioner; and having succeeded in his attempt he persuaded Major Clay to believe that the Cash and accounts in my charge were not correct, and accordingly brought to your Petitioner's house. Major Clay on the evening of the 30th May 1870, taking advantage of the opportunity when your Petitioner had sent the Cash and accounts to Survaipully, where your Petitioner, who had to perform additional duties of which he was placed in charge, had made preparations to go on the following morning to pay the Coolies and workmen employed there. The Police Inspector persuaded Major Clay that your Petitioner had not his Cash and accounts ready, Mr. Reason knowing fully that they had been dispatched to Survaipully. But as on that day, your Petitioner was indisposed and was not able to see Major Clay, your Petitioner's servants told him that your Petitioner was not at home. As soon as your Petitioner was made aware that Major Clay persisted on seeing him, your Petitioner at once appeared; when Major Clay asked your Petitioner to produce his Cash and accounts and your Petitioner informed him of having sent them in advance to Survaipully, as he was going there the following morning. Upon this Major Clay directed your Petitioner to send up to him the Cash and accounts and said that he would suspend your Petitioner. He said so. On the following morning your Petitioner accordingly sent men to Survaipully with instructions to take the Cash and accounts direct to Major Clay and produced them before

before him; and on same evening in due time they were accordingly taken to him, but as Major Clay was absent from his house and returned home late in the evening, he consequently received the Cash and accounts late. He subsequently examined them and found them all correct. This of course did not please the Police Inspector Mr. Reason who, finding himself disappointed in this attempt, next persuaded Major Clay to believe that some of the vouchers sent in support of payments were forgeries and that they were not bona fide documents.

This tale of the Inspector which was implicitly believed by Major Clay was considered by him to be a sufficient ground for your Petitioner's dismissal and for prosecution before the Magistrate.

Major Clay before ascertaining the truth of the Police Inspector's statement or calling upon your Petitioner for any kind of explanation, not only rashly and unjustly dismissed your Petitioner from his situation without the previous sanction of the Superintending Engineer according to the departmental Rules, but also preferred criminal charges of Forgery and Misappropriation against your Petitioner, and reported the same to the Superintending Engineer, who also without calling for any explanation from your Petitioner or inquiring for the result of the Criminal Prosecution which had been commenced by Major Clay before the Magistrate, confirmed the summary dismissal of your Petitioner, as will be seen from the copies of the report of Major Clay dated 6th June 1870 No. 60 and of the Superintending Engineer's docket dated 13th June 1870 No. 152 marked B and C hereunto submitted.

submitted.
7. Subsequently Major Clay, upon
his examination of the parties who executed the
vouchers, which had been declared to him by
the Police Inspector to be Forgeries, found that
the said vouchers were bona fide documents,
and perceiving that his charges would fail, &
withdrew his prosecution from the Magistrate
as would be seen from the Copies of his reports
to the Superintending Engineer, dated 14th June 1870
No 74 and 4th July 1870. No 97 marked D. and
K submitted herewith.

8. In the report of Major Clay
to the Superintending Engineer dated 4th July 1870
No 97 marked K he stated as his reasons for
the dismissal of Your Petitioner the following
three grounds, viz: -

- 1st Strong suspicion of dishonesty.
 - 2nd Notoriously evil habits of drunkenness
 - 3rd Falsehood and repeated disobedience of orders
9. As regards the three grounds
of Your Petitioner most respectfully begs to submit
that they are unfounded; since there was not
a single instance, either recorded or expressed
by Major Clay previous to this unfortunate event,
during a period of 3 years service under Major
Clay, or by his predecessors, during any other
period, during which Your Petitioner served, of
any probable ground or reason for suspecting
Your Petitioner of dishonesty, or drunkenness,
or falsehoods, but on the contrary the good
opinion now and then expressed and recorded
in the official registers by the General Officers
Your Petitioner served under, of which Your
Petitioner.

7
Petitioner was unable to get Copies, as well as the Copies
of the very few testimonials in your Petitioner's possession
which are herewith submitted marked L, will prove
that your Petitioner bore no such Character or Conduct
as was represented of him in Major Clay's letter. Your
Petitioner being dissatisfied with the order of dismissal
and in the ardent hope of obtaining redress, preferred
an appeal to the Superintending Engineer showing
elaboration the utter want of any reasonable or
valid grounds for the charges alleged against your
Petitioner by Major Clay, and stating all the circum-
stances which led to your Petitioner's ruin under the
plots concerted by the Police Inspector and Major
Clay to reconsider his order of dismissal restore your
Petitioner to his situation.

10. As a result of the said appeal,
Copy of which is herewith submitted marked M, will
clearly show how your Petitioner's ruin was sought and
how unjustly your Petitioner was dismissed from
service without being allowed to say even a word
before his dismissal, either in explanation or in
defence of the charges stated by Major Clay against
your Petitioner and how unfortunate your Petitioner
was in not being able to obtain any redress from the
Superintending Engineer who refused to reconsider
his first orders as will be seen from the document
marked N also herewith submitted.
Your Petitioner has suffered all
kinds of hardships and his ruin as well as the ruin
of your Petitioner's family has been much summarily
accomplished by the conspiracy of a Police Inspector
and by the irregular proceedings of your Petitioner's
official superiors in respect of the illegal
proceedings of the Magistracy, who, in disposing
of

of the Case against your Petitioner, exceeded their
authority, and expressed opinions unauthorized in
law, in a manner to prevent your Petitioner's
obtaining redress even from the Civil authorities
for the disgrace your Petitioner has suffered -
your Petitioner being afraid of trespassing on
your honour's valuable time with the long account
of the various ways in which he was unjustly
dealt with; your Petitioner begs leave to conclude
his humble Petition without any comments on the
Magistrates Proceedings which your Petitioner
considers are unnecessary to dilate upon in this
Memorial -
In conclusion your Petitioner
who has been summarily dismissed after six
years faithful and zealous approved and
recorded services even without future prospects
of employment, humbly and most respectfully
prays that your honour will be graciously pleased
to consider your Petitioner's most unfortunate and
forlorn Case and lay the same before His Excellency
the Right Honourable the Governor in Council for
his Lordship's most favourable and benevolent
consideration and obtain his Excellency's orders
for the restoration of your Petitioner to his former
situation or for your Petitioner's reemployment
in any other District; as, in the absence of any
just redress which is always granted to the
aggrieved under the renowned administration
of the British Government, your Petitioner
and his family are likely to be ruined and
fall a prey for ever to the plots and intrigues
of a single individual who has concerted
your Petitioner's ruin without any prospects of
ever

ever regaining your Petitioner's character and
honesty.

For doing this act of benevolence
and justice your Petitioner will for ever Pray.

23rd April 1871
Chingleput.

Saund Parthasarathy Saiboo

Your Petitioner's address

S. Parthasarathy Saiboo

Care of

S. Narasimhaiah Saiboo

at

Chingleput

My dear Parthasarathy Naikoo
 Can you favour me by raising no
 objection to some palminah trees being cut down on the
 Laboon Tank Bund? I am building a Bungalow here with
 the Sahaidar's note from which you will see that your
 assistance is required.

Yours sincerely
 W. Beeson.

My dear Parthasarathy Naikoo
 Please let me know some if I may
 cut down the trees off Somarigapalle Tank Bund. I have
 written to you three times, but I have not received any
 reply.

Yours sincerely
 W. Beeson

My dear Friend
 Sorry to give you so much trouble but
 you will see from the Sahaidar's remarks that he requires
 some thing more definite as to the trees I wish to cut.
 will in no way require the land. I shall feel obliged if
 you will give a letter to the effect that you have no
 objection to my cutting trees on the S. Tank Bund.

Yours sincerely
 W. Beeson

Referred to the
 Superintendent
 Engineer of the
 Division for report

4th May 1871
 Secretary to Govt
 Madras

From Parthasarathy
 Naikoo
 Late Taluk Coover
 Nellore District
 dated 29th June
 recd 11th May 1871
 W. Beeson

Notice for
 information to the
 Board of Directors
 Messrs in the
 Public Works Deptt -

1883-22-22
 3 June

My dear Parthasarathy Saibon

I have already written 2 letters to you asking you to sanction the cutting down of 30 Palmrah trees on the Lomara Zapulla Tank Round but you have not condescended to send me as yet any reply.

Please send me an answer soon and oblige

Yours Sincerely

Signed/

W. Beeson

6-4-70

My dear Parthasarathy Saibon

This is the 4th or 5th letter I have written to you about the cutting of trees at Lomara Zapulla, but you have not condescended to answer one of them.

I cannot account for your silence unless you want to

show me what a very big man you are and to be as

disrespectful as possible. I wrote to you in a friendly

manner and it was your duty to have answered my

letters. If you consider what I ask you to be too much

of a fear you should like a man say so at once and

not make a fool of me as you are doing from day to

day besides delaying my work. I again ask you for

the last time whether I may cut the trees required and

if not why not, so that I may appeal if necessary

to some one else, for the courtesy you have denied me

not only as a supposed friend but as an owner in

the S.P.W. in a matter of business.

Yours Sincerely

Signed/

W. Beeson

Confidential.

Signed W.B.

My dear Parthasarathy Saibon

I have paid for some Government trees and as the Sahaidan directed me to apply to you for permission to cut the said trees, and as I have failed to receive any reply from you, altho I have written to you 7 or 8 times. This is to inform you that I intend writing to your Superior Officer tomorrow, if I don't in the meanwhile receive a reply and represent to him the whole transaction for his orders. The application I made to you is a business matter and you are bound to give me an answer of some sort.

I regret that I have even troubled you. If I had written to Major Clay in the first instance I could have received a reply long ere this.

Yours Sincerely

Signed/

W. Beeson

Three Copies/

Sau Parthasarathy Saibon

... to the ...
... to the ...

To the Superintendent Engineer
of the ... Division

I have the honor to bring the following
circumstances to your notice. In consequence of certain
information I have received on the evening of the 30th
Uldeo I went accompanied by Police Inspector
B. B. B. to the house of Overseer S. Parthasarathy
Kaisar for the purpose of ascertaining whether his cash
and accounts were correct as my information led me
to believe that a large portion of a sum of Rupees 1000
which he had just drawn for the payment of works had
been misappropriated.

On arrival at the house I was told
the Overseer was out; I knew this was not the case and
persisted in seeing him after about a quarter of an
hour the door was opened and I found the Overseer
partially drunk sitting on a chair he pretended he
did not know I was at the door but this was a lie
as I moved than once sent his own Lascar to tell him
who it was. On my asking for his cash box and
accounts he said he had not got them that he had
sent them to ... to which place he was going
himself the next day. He then said he had paid all
the Rupees 1000 away in exchange of four in fact
as fast as one he was brought home to him he told
another which only involved him deeper. As I could
not make him deliver up his cash box and could not
search his house as we had no search warrants I left
the house.

The Police proved that no cash box or books were sent to Survapully as stated by the Quereen. On the night of the 31st the Quereen sent his Cassa with Cash and books to my house, at about 10 P.M. I sealed all up in the presence of the Quereen's and my own Cassa and locked up the money. The next day I went to Survapully and found that no payments had been made to the bricklayers and Coolies, since the 18th May last and that about Rs. 500. was owing. I then returned on the 4th to Killore, after full inquiry at Survapully and on having the money sent by the Quereen counted me founde Rupees 539.24, she has also produced vouchers (not yet verified) for Rs. 564, should these vouchers not be bona fides I shall take the Quereen before a Magistrate.

Under the most favorable view of the case, I find that she has told me several gross falsehoods, that she has been frequently drunk and that she has disobeyed my repeated orders to the effect that all sums due to Contractors, woodiers and others for work done above the value of Rs. 10 should invariably be paid by Cheques drawn in favour of the individual. I have therefore dismissed Quereen L. Parthasarathy from employment in the S P W from the date of his suspension as reported to you in my clock at No 51 dated 31st May, subject to your Confirmation. Since writing the above I have found that the vouchers are forgeries and the Quereen has now been charged before the Magistrate with Forgery and Criminal Misappropriation.

True Copy /
Sd/- Parthasarathy Sain

12 152

To The Officer in charge of the
Killore Range

No 60 ... June. Approves and
Confirms the dismissal of and proceedings
against Quereen L. Parthasarathy Sain

Signed
J. J. Doherty Col. R. E.
Sd/- Engineer and Division
Dumulpattam
3rd June 1870.

True Copy /
Sd/- Parthasarathy Sain

D
No 76

To
The Superintending Engineer
2nd Division

Sir:-
In continuation of my letter No 60 dated
6th instant I have the honor to inform you that I have
reason to doubt if the evidence I can produce in support
of the charges against Late Amerson S. Parthasarathy Chakr
is sufficient to produce a conviction. I have withdrawn
the case from before the Magistrate. I have therefore
to request you will confirm his dismissal from the
date of his suspension as communicated in my docket
dated 31st May No 51

/Signed/
A. D. Day Esq
Executive Engineer A.R.

Followed
14th June 1870

/true Copy/
Sd/- Parthasarathy Chakr

23rd Nov 1897.
The Superintending Engineer,
of the 2nd Division

Sir..

In reply to your letter No 170 of 20th ultimo I have the honor to inform you that I was advised that in as much as I could not prove that Government had actually sustained any injury or loss a Criminal prosecution against S. Parthasarathy Kaidoo would fail. There is no doubt that Parthasarathy Kaidoo made use of Government money for his own purposes between the 23rd May and the date of my visit to his house, and that he had not at that time his Cash balance correct, but when he next evening sent up his accounts to my house he had provided money in the bagan to the amount of Rs 539-2-6 and produced vouchers for Rs 689-7-0. One of the latter Inspector Reason of the Police declared to be a Forgery and that there was no such person in Killore, as the supposed signer of the receipt. On enquiry however a man came forward who said he had signed the receipt, which was for 208 Cubic yards of Latite Stone delivered, but he also said that he had not received the money all at one time, but in small sums in three different payments. Parthasarathy Kaidoo's books show no such transaction. I have not the faintest doubt in my own mind of the guilt of Parthasarathy Kaidoo, but legal proof is always difficult in cases where time has been afforded to replace money, as the case then in law becomes a matter of account and not of Criminality. The grounds on which I urged the dismissal of Parthasarathy Kaidoo are fresh strong suspicions.

suspicion of dishonesty, 2nd his notoriously evil life and habits of drunkenness, he is now suffering from D.T. thereby his falsehood and his repeated disobedience of orders.

(Signed)

Mallard
4th July 1870

A. D. Clay Esq.
Resident Engineer at R.

(true Copy)

James Parthasarathy Naidu

College of Civil Engineering — Fort St. George
Certificate No. 202 dated the 30th May 1864

Name — S. Parthasarathy Naidu
Race — Hindoo Religion — Vishnu age 21 years
Qualified for the grade of Salary Overseer in the S. P. W. under para 13 of Public Works Notification dated 2nd March 1860. Passed at the College.

(Signed)

W. H. Edgcome Captain R. E.
Principal of C. E. College.

Civil Engineering College
Fort St. George.

I do hereby certify that S. Parthasarathy Naidu has been a student in the 1st Class of the 2nd Department of the Civil Engineering College at Madras during the sessions 1863/64 and that he has been diligent & well behaved. S. Parthasarathy Naidu stood sixth in his class (consisting of 24 students) at the annual examination held in May 1864; and in special subjects his position was as follows: Seventh in Mathematics, Seventh in Engineering and Fifth in Surveying.

(Signed)

W. H. Edgcome Capt. R. E.
Principal

Madras —
30th May 1864

Saoro Parthasarathy Naidu has been under me for about two months & a half. He is sharp, willing, and very anxious to do his duties properly and with experience and his health permitting I should think would make a very good Overseer.

(Signed)

A. L. Disherly Capt.
Ex. Engineer

Mallard —
28th October 1864

(true Copy)

James Parthasarathy Naidu

To

Lieut. Colonel F. J. Moberly
Superintending Engineer
2nd Division
Bengal.

Honored Sir

x herewith annexed

I have already represented in a former communication that the accusations against me is the result of enmity &c. Since writing to your honor on the 23rd July 1870, Major Clay was pleased to grant me copies of reports against me. From these it would be evident that a Mr. Suspect Besson, who I have already stated, has not been on good terms with me of late, is bottom of the whole case. I enclose a copy of a threatening note to me about some job which he wanted for a house he is building and my great delay to help him in the way of getting good shilling materials for his house by using my official influence has reduced me to this of light.

As to the circumstances under which Major Clay dismissed me in his honor on 4th 86 of 6 June last to me, Major Clay states "on careful enquiry I have found Engineer Parthasarathy Aida has been guilty of telling his Dargi Officer many gross falsehoods in order to deceive him with reference to the state of his accounts" What enquiry he made and of whom I have not been aware of if at all an enquiry, it was behind my back although I was present at the time. Why should my accounts be discredited and my statements be disbelieved

there is not the slightest reason shown - In his report N° 97 to your honor of 4th July 1870, Major Clay states that "one of the latter (receipts) Inspector Besson of the Police declared to be forgery, and there was no such person in Kelton as the supposed signor of the receipt." Here again as I had already stated Mr. Inspector Besson's words is taken as Gospel-truth, because I have not importantly ingratiated his favor, the receipt I tendered is a "Forgery" and with all respect to Mr. Besson's Credit as Police Inspector Officer. It is said that the signor of this receipt is an imaginary individual at first, but again "on enquiry" a man came forward who said he had signed the "receipt." I leave my superior to conceive as to the way in which what is styled "enquiry" has been made. What prevented Major Clay in calling on me to point out who the man was? I am unable to understand. Instead of this natural course the receipt is put into the hands of a Police Officer, to fish out the man indicated in the receipt; and if the individual had not come forward, the circumstances of the Police Officer not having been able to find out the man; must go against me. It again what circumstances go to show that the receipt is a Forgery, there is nothing to show but the Inspector's bare words - Now having escaped fortunately the imputation of having brought in an imaginary individual. I am not aware that any enquiry was made of the man, who had come forward, by Major Clay; the account as to the Minutes of payments & is all the story of Inspector Besson. - I leave it again to my Superior to judge of the nature of the enquiry

enquiry made both by the Police and Major Clay. The Police are neither adepts nor experts in ascertaining the Forgery. Were there not more competent men to whom Major Clay might entrust enquiry in his own department. There is a receipt and an individual produced as the party who gave it, who does not deny payment. It is for the party accusing to prove the Forgery. If the bare words of a Police man, with whom I am not in good terms, is to be taken to attack dishonestly, I need hardly say that it is any thing but even-handed justice. I request your honor to send for any notes of any enquiry about this matter made by Major Clay and satisfy whether any fair enquiry or any thing like a decent enquiry made, besides trusting to the Inspector's report. I humbly request your honor to call for any record to see if there had been a single instance during a period of nearly 3 years under Major Clay, in which he had reason to suspect my honesty; besides in this instance, where his opinion is based on a report of one in bad terms. So the malicious report of a Police officer to be taken as a conclusive evidence against my character & with my fate finally settled. Go, Major Clay says "In consequence of some information he had received on the evening of the 30th May last, he came to my house accompanied by Inspector Besson for the purpose of ascertaining the correctness of cash balance & accounts. What the information, or on whose information, it was no where distinctly stated from Inspector having associated, he must have been the informant. Be it as it may the information was, that I had misappropriated a large portion of Rupees 1000, I had lately drawn

drawn. Major Clay says I was partially drunk, that he questioned me about the cash balance & cash book &c, and that he did not believe the account I gave, that the cash & books were sent to Survapulle, and that the Police proved that no box or books was sent to Survapulle. If I were drunk how is it possible for Major Clay to have questioned me about the details of cash balance, how was I able to answer him in detail, why did not Major Clay naturally ask me to come down at once or to send a Lascar or any body to point out to his Police agents where my cash box was at Survapulle, which was a simpler course to have tested the truth of my statement, instead of making one sided enquiry behind my back. All these show that the Police under color of duty were misleading Major Clay to satisfy a private grudge. Surely the Police who pretended to know that I had misappropriated Government money, must if their information is worth any thing have also known where my large cash box was at the time. - Major Clay says he did not search my house, because he had not a warrant to do so. then why did he bring the Police Inspector to my house. If not to take some immediate action, did the Inspector come to prevent Major Clay to listen to any thing. I had to say against what he said already prejudicial against me. From Major Clay's statement, that he did not search my house for a warrant, it is plain he would have searched had he one. I say to surmount that there are nearly half a dozen Magistrates in Nellore Town, and the District Magistrate holds his office

to a very late hour, it would not have taken half an hour to have got a warrant and especially there was the risk of Government losing Rs. 1000. - All these circumstances are sufficient to show that Major Clay gave himself up rather too much to the bare words of the Police Inspector Mr. Beeson, who did his best to ruin me, owing to enmity. Major Clay in his statement before the District Magistrate states, that I had replaced the money from the Atkary shops in Nellore. In the first place what interest have I in the Atkary shops, 2ndly how did the keen eyed Police, who took the trouble to know I took money, and where my box was, and found out an imaginary receipt signer, fail to catch me collecting a large amount of copper to the extent of nearly more than Rs. 500 all over Nellore Town, while there are Police spies over my uniform and movements of my friends house and against the movements of my friends from the 30th May up to the 1st June. Cash. Where did Major Clay get his information? It is from the Inspector Beeson of Police. From all the above it would be evident that the charge of dishonesty laid its foundation not on facts discovered by Major Clay, but on the hearsay of Police Reports. As to my notoriously evil life & drunkenness & my suffering from D.T. I would respectfully beg your honor to ascertain, on how many occasions did Major Clay catch me drunk for the last three years, & directly served under him & has known any former occasion reported me for drunkenness and if it is not Major Clay's personal knowledge is this information also from my Police Friends. In the case it is fair that Major Clay should not only

summarily

summarily decide judicially that I am a Forger
and Medically, certify that I am suffering from DT.
Even a worst felon has a better protection under
this benign Government, than that shown to me
by Major Clay after nearly six years service
under different masters, with credit. I have
nothing to say but simply to deny the charge of
drunkenness. What are my habits of notoriously
evil life? Major Clay has not said: if things
are so notorious it is surprising nothing was
heard of before, or my dishonesty, drunkenness,
& evil habits of life, must be one day's creation
by Police Magistrate.

I leave it to your honor to determine
if there is any little of evidence to support the
grave charges of Dishonesty & Drunkenness
that would decide my fate throughout my
life in the woods.

As to the 3rd Charge of repeated
disobedience to orders. I beg to state, that
I received a Circular from the Range Officer,
either by the end of April or by the beginning
of May, to the effect of sending in Bills
to the Range Office for amounts due to Petty
Contractors & which exceed ten Rupees for pay-
ment. I was ordered by the Range Officer to
take over charge of the Suvapalli works, in
addition to my charge of the Delta Portion,
which I did on the 18th of May. I was ordered
to attend the Range Office, where I was from
the 18th up to 24th May. The former Overseer on
the Suvapalli works has sent in a Memo,
that 3,000 Rupees will be required for expenditure
during the month and had expended Rs 1,400
between the 1st & 14th of the month. Being in

31
the Range Office between the 18th & 24th May last
and had a very little knowledge as to the actual
expenditure for the remaining days of the month,
I first indented cheques for 1000 & odd Rupees and
considering again the difficulty of expending that
whole amount of Indent I reduced the amount
to Rupees 1000. After the cheques had been received,
I came to understand by the examination of the
works that the whole amount drawn could not be
expended by the end of the month, I paid part of
the amount to Petty Contractors & so as to leave by
the end of the month, nearly the actual amount
to be paid to them. I particularly adopted this
course, that I might comply both with the Circular
of the Controller, which strictly prohibited large
balance in the hands of Overseers at the end
of the month, and the circular that expenditure
should neither fall short nor exceed the amount
indented for. I am surprised to find this one
instance will ever make a subordinate liable
to be charged with repeated disobedience to
orders.

These are my explanations of the
faults ascribed to me by the Range Officer and
I implicitly trust that your honor will give due &
important consideration to them.

In conclusion I humbly pray and
earnestly hope that your honor will save me from
the utter state of ruination I have been brought
to, by the unfounded & malicious statements of
my enemies, either by giving me an appointment
in any of the other Ranges or by giving me an
endorsement, as to leave me an opportunity of getting
one, when vacancy may occur. I remain to be
Signed J. Parthasarathy Saibon

16th September 1870

True Copy
J. Parthasarathy Saibon

३

Superintendent Engineer

2nd Division - 1881

Bezwała.

"Honored Sir"

I beg respectfully to lay the following
circumstances for your Honor's kind consideration in
the hope that you would obtain full justice at your
Honor's hands. I have been employed in Millore & Co's

honors. hands. I have been employed in Mallore district
as Sub. Bursar from June 1864 for nearly six years
and served Majors G. D. Roberts, Major & Arthurson,
Major G. D. Roberts without

and served Major S. D. Clark without
Dr. R. Smith and Major S. D. Clark without
committing myself in any way in the discharge of
my duties. I could respectfully refer you to the
records in the Range Office - I

committing myself in
my duties. I could respectfully refer you to the
General registers in records in the Range Office. I
must admit (as to the best of my recollection) that
during the whole term of my ⁱⁿ ^{my} service, I had
been furnished but once with a ^{copy} ^{of} an account of some
plan. I believe, I have some

been joined but once to
delay in sending in a plan. I believe, I have done
the duties entrusted to me to the best of my abilities
and to the satisfaction of my immediate superiors.
While so. Dragon A. S. Cammison

and to the satisfaction of
 While so, Major A. D. Clamenden
 whose orders I have seen for the last three years,
 all on a sudden called over to my house, on the 30th
 about 6 o'clock, accompanied

May 1870, in the evening about 6 o'clock, accompanied
by the Town Police Inspector one Mr. Mason asked
me for my cash and accounts. I told him that they
were just then at Liverpool, where I had sent them
last ~~the~~ noon, so as to reach in day light as I had
arranged to go there myself that night, to pay some
bills.

David

having been prevented by sudden illness to accompany the Cash. As to his further enquiries I replied that after all payments there would be left a balance of about 4 or 5 Rs on the 31st idem, i.e. the next day. Major Clay, before leaving me that evening told me to send the Cash and accounts. The sudden visit when it was nearly dark, of Major Clay, with a Police Inspector, who had not been in good terms with me lately, surprised me, and was a source of anxiety. To produce the Cash and accounts before Major Clay the next day I procured my payments at Curvaully and ordered the money and account books to be taken direct to Major Clay from Curvaully, which reached his Bungalow. I understand between 5 & 6 O'clock P.M. Major Clay being absent from home, took charge of the money that night when he returned home. When I next saw Major Clay he said, he suspended me pending enquiry. I heard nothing further from Major Clay, officially till the 7th June 1870, when he wrote that he had dismissed me, pending sanction.

That very day I was taken up by the Police, on charge of Criminal Breach of Trust by Public Servant and Forgery, on complaint of Major Clay, without a word of explanation having been demanded of me. On the 14th June, Major Clay appeared before the Magistrate, and the case was dismissed. Major Clay, having represented that he had no evidence to support his charge, altho himself, Mr. Beeson and his Police, and certain others of the S. P. W. did their best and turned up every stone to trump up a charge against me. While still expecting I would be called up for explanation at least before the case is finally settled

settled, to my great surprise, I saw in the District Gazette your honor's orders dismissing me, without a defence a privilege graciously allowed under this Government even to a notorious felon. On seeing the Gazette notice I requested Major Clay for copies of accusations he had sent to your honor against me, to enable me to lay my case fully before you, but hitherto I had not been favoured with copies of any papers.

I therefore humbly request your honor will be pleased to favour me with copies of all the reports against me to enable me to lay the case fully before you. The whole case against me is a work of conspiracy and it is hard I should fall a victim to it and the vulgar rumours against S. P. W. generally, after nearly a period of 6 years faithful service.

Having been put to the disgrace of an arrest and a Public Criminal inquiry, I hoped I would have had the consolation of retrieving my character by proving my innocence and exposing the character of those who compassed my ruin. Now having lost that opportunity by the case having been withdrawn, it is nothing but fair, I should be allowed an opportunity of explaining matters to your honor's satisfaction.

I beg leave to remain
Honored Sir

22nd June 1870
Bellare.

Yours most Obedt & Afft Servant
Signed J. Parthasarathy Aiyar.

True Copy
J. Parthasarathy Aiyar

11
Memo from the Superintending Engineer
of the 2nd Division, on the appeal Petition of S.
Parthasaradhy Naidu dated 16th September 1870.

12/85

The Superintending Engineer declines
to reconsider the decision in S. Parthasaradhy
Naidu's Case; there appears abundant reasons
for removing him from the D. P. W.
Signed

Pengola
24th November 1870.

J. J. Enderby, Col. R.E.
Supt Engineer 2nd Div.

True Copy

S. Parthasaradhy Naidu

2538

Sami Parthasarathy

17 Dept
1883.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
No 23
Superintending Engineer's Office
2nd Division
Masulipatam
27th May 1871

From Colonel F. Maberly R.E.
Superintending Engineer
2nd Division

To Colonel J. Harpendale R.E.
Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

Enclosures -
1 letter from
Major Clay Secy
No 627
June 1870
1 do from
No 7097 of 1st original
to Major Clay referring
to July 1870
1 do from do to the petition to Government
No 117 of 22nd May 1871 returned
1 request to be
renewed

I have the honor to enclose letters
I have the honor to enclose letters
I may observe that I had heard from
Major Clay personally what he has now
at my request, written in his No 117 of
22nd May 1871. before I rejected the appeal
of S. Parthasarathy I know -

I have the honor to
inform you most obediently
your obedient servant
Colonel Maberly R.E.
and disobedience of
orders; and his petition
to be reinstated is
dated 28th April 1871.
The whole of the cir-

P. M. 2538/71
An 22nd June 1871 L. H. 495.

Dist of down

P. 4. 18 7th Sept
No. of 100 for June
J. 11. 18. 2538.

From The Supy Engineer
To The Secretary to
Government
D. P. W.

3/27 May 1871
Recd 3 June 71

Enclose a certain
letter in original
from Major Clapp
touching the appeal
petition, herewith
returned of S. Partha
Sura by road to Govt.

No. 1683. 22 June 71

13398

617 June 19

Dist of down

Recd 11 Sept

No. 1683.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
their date the 22 June 1871
Read the following
From S. Partha, acting Engineer dated 28 April 1871
To the Supy Engineer dated 27 May
From the Supy Engineer dated 27 May

N
It appears that the
Petitioner who was em-
ployed as a Tally
man in the Kellie
Dick was dismissed
from the 31st May 70
on a strong suspicion
of dishonesty, his habits
of drunkenness, falsehood,
and disobedience of
orders; and his petition
to be reinstated is
dated 28th April 1871
The whole of the cir-

- circumstances have been
fully enquired into;
and the result leaves
no room for doubt
that the Petitioner was
unfitted for the post he
held and was properly
dismissed. It further
appears that in the
quarterly returns im-
mediately preceding
his dismissal, namely,
in October 69 and Jan'y/70,
the petitioner was un-
favorably reported
on; and the Govern^t
cannot sanction his
re-employment in the
Department.

J. 15th

To
The Suptg Engrs and for
L. Parthasarathy Chaudh.
Recd 23/6/71

Govt of 1871 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Superintending Engr
2nd Division

Dated

Recd

G. O 22nd Dec 1871, No. 1682

Nos. 1371 399

[Faint handwritten text, possibly a signature or address, mostly illegible due to fading.]