M.R.O. 1—77,005—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 264

(2) Date of repair 13. 3. 45

(3) Initials of the Referencer

# MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

---

## Government of Madras.

Public works **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1355 Press / Mis.

491-95

Dated 31. 5 1872.

***Not to be folded or roughly handled***

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department.*
*31st May* 1872.

Read the following letters :—

No. 491. From the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madura, 30th January 1872, No. 4,195.

In obedience to the instructions contained in paragraph 3 of G. O. dated 20th September 1871, No. 2,401, directing me to report specially on the alleged misconduct of Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay, I have now the honour to submit the result of the inquiry made by Mr. Sub-Engineer McNair under the orders of Executive Engineer Mr. G. S. Sage, together with the further investigations made by me into the same subject.

2. Attached to this letter is a list of all the papers now forwarded, and while regretting their great number, I have no alternative but to forward them in view to the proper understanding by the Government of this most unsatisfactory and tortuous case.

3. In paragraph 5 of my letter printed with the G. O. quoted, I have given the opinion I have formed in regard to the Supervisor, and I feel satisfied that a perusal of the accompanying papers will convince the Government that Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay has proved himself not only unfit for the position of Range Officer, but utterly untrustworthy in every way, and that on this account he is no longer deserving of being retained in the service of Government.

4. As I have, in the investigation made by me, given at sufficient length my opinion (see my report, enclosure No. 81) in regard to each of the charges produced against Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay, there remains but little for me to add here.

5. I have already, in my letter quoted in paragraph 3, reported that the money of Government was being diverted from its allotted channels, and that the roads and tanks and irrigation works generally in the late 4th Range, already much deteriorated, were falling into rapid decay. Mr. Sage has, in frequent instances, since assuming charge of the range, corroborated this statement; and I need only allude here to the state of the cotton road and the high road from Madura to Tinnevelly as being marked instances of the reprehensible neglect and mismanagement—to call his conduct by its least unpleasant names—evinced in this respect by the Supervisor; while the work that has been executed and paid for by him to the Vellaticolum Cutcherry and Jail, and for the buttresses of the Sattoor bridge, clearly, to my mind, indicates fraud on the Supervisor's part.

6. The cotton road on which a maintenance allowance of Rupees 400 per mile, for the first five miles from Tuticorin, has for many years been allotted, was in excellent order when Vyapoory Pillay assumed charge of the range. Although the same allotment has been continued during his charge of the range, the road over these miles has deteriorated to such an extent as to call for the public censure, on a recent occasion, of the Local Fund Board, and has necessitated the preparation of a supplemental and emergent estimate of Rupees 4,000 to put this portion of the road into its former state of repair.

7. In like manner, with regard to the Trunk Road No. 2, a supplemental estimate of Rupees 2,000 has just been received from the Range Officer for

sanction for the repairs urgently required thereto, which if the maintenance allotment of Rupees 200 per mile had been *bona fide* expended on the road, as charged for, it most assuredly would not have needed.

8. It would appear moreover that the conduct of the Supervisor has been so notorious in the range that through fear, and in order to keep things quiet, he has been compelled to submit, as Range Officer, to considerable irregularities and even indignities from his office subordinates.

9. To this circumstance may be attributed the conduct of the Head Accountant, Nullasivum Pillay, and the 3rd Accountant, Lalah Meah, who have behaved in an unbecoming manner towards their immediate superior, have neglected their duties, and have attended the office when they pleased, and performed only as much work as they pleased. Highly improper as was such conduct on their parts, the Supervisor has never reported it, and appears to have been afraid to do so.

10. The Head Accountant has aided and abetted the Supervisor in altering and twice re-binding the cash book, and he (as well as the Supervisor) has concealed the fact from the Superintending Engineer and the Controller's Manager. The 3rd Accountant has, with the help of his brother Sundoo Meah, forwarded anonymous or pseudonymous petitions against his immediate superior, and has also instigated others to do so. I may mention here that the Head Accountant has now been transferred by me to the Southern Range, Tinnevelly.

11. It is now with extreme reluctance that I touch upon a matter which I consider it my duty to bring to the prominent notice of Government. I refer to the highly unsatisfactory report submitted by Mr. Sage, as the result of the investigations conducted under his orders in this case.

12. Far be it from me to attribute motives, or to rely on reports (Nos. 76 to 78); but judging entirely from the facts of the case, I submit that it is simply impossible for me to understand how Mr. Sage can have arrived at the favourable opinion in regard to the Supervisor, as reported in his letters, Nos. 165 and 216, dated 30th November and 27th December 1871, respectively, (Nos. 50 and 69 on the list).

13. The manner in which the preliminary inquiry into the charges against the Supervisor was conducted by Mr. Sage, namely, his not attempting to obtain the evidence of the witnesses in a calm, dignified, and dispassionate manner, has resulted in a palpable failure in regard to the whole truth being elicited. That this is clearly proved, I would refer you to the statements of Head Accountant Nullasivum Pillay (H. and No. 71), of Taluq Overseer's Writer Venkatachellum Iyengar (G. and No. 72), the Superintending Engineer's letters to Mr. Sage (Nos. 73 and 80), Mr. Sage's reply (No. 74), regarding these statements and my marginal remarks thereon.

14. When I delegated Mr. McNair to the conduct of the investigation under Mr. Sage's orders, I did so not only because it appeared to me that it would be unbecoming to ignore, in the investigation in question, a Range Officer of Mr. Sage's length of service and experience, but also because I thought, and I had a right to expect, that Mr. Sage would have given me, and through me the Government, the benefit of his calm and unprejudiced assistance in such an investigation. The result has indeed been truly unfortunate, and I feel confident, judging from Mr. McNair's patient and thorough manner of taking evidence, that had he been left to conduct the inquiry independent of Mr. Sage's arrangements* and supervision, the facts that would have been elicited—but which it is now too late to elicit—would have been of a still more disparaging nature to the Supervisor than what has been actually the case, and indeed would probably have been such as would have ensured beyond all doubt a Magisterial conviction being obtained against the Supervisor, at least for the frauds which, as I have already said, are to my mind clearly proved in the cases of the buttresses to Sattoor bridge and the buildings at Vellaticolum.

* Note.—Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay's deposition (Enclosure No. 36) was dictated by Mr. Sage.

15. As it is, I myself feel quite satisfied that a conviction can be obtained in the two instances named against the Supervisor; but with the papers before them, the Government will be able to form their own opinion on this point.

16. It will be understood therefore that I am far from sharing Mr. Sage's expressed opinion in regard to Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay, and after the severe punishment that has recently been meted out by the Government to members of the late 3rd Range, Tinnevelly, for similar frauds, mismanagement, and irregularities, it would be, as it appears to me, inconsistent and indeed monstrously unfair were no notice, as Mr. Sage suggests, to be taken of the Supervisor's grave misconduct—to call it by its least harsh name—in allowing the late No. 4 Range, Tinnevelly, to sink into such a deplorable state of neglect as to be the scandal of the Public Works Department. And I feel confident therefore that the Government will assert their authority in this case, and make such an example as will prove their determination to put an end to the exhibition in future of such departmental laches as those under notice.

---

No. 492. From the same officer, dated Madura, 5th February 1872, No. 4,332.

1 Original letter.
* No. 293, dated 31st January 1872.

In reference to my letter No. 4,195, dated 30th ultimo, forwarding my report on Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay's case, I have the honour to state that I have this day received the accompanying original letter* from Executive Engineer Mr. Sage, in charge Northern Range, Tinnevelly, and I forward it with a view to its being appended to the enclosures of my letter above quoted.

---

No. 493. From the same officer, dated on Circuit Virdooputty, 19th February 1872, No. 4,534.

1 Petition.
1 Service Register.

At the request contained in the accompanying petition from Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay, dated the 13th instant, I have the honour herewith to submit a copy of his service register as found recorded in the books in the office.

2. Having already fully reported upon Vyapoory Pillay's case in my letter to Government, No. 4,195, dated 30th January 1872, I have nothing further to add thereto, and it remains for the Government to dispose of the same according to its merits.

3. I cannot however refrain from remarking on the present occasion that Vyapoory Pillay proved himself indeed an excellent public servant, as testified by the several officers under whom he served, so long as his services were confined to office duties; but that when promoted to the executive branch, and placed in a position (as Supervisor in charge of a range) where it was within his competency to help himself to Government funds, he has not scrupled to take advantage of that position to do so, and to benefit himself in such a manner and with such unscrupulousness as I believe few Supervisors have ever attempted before.

4. It is quite possible, that as stated in paragraph 7 of his letter, nearly every one who has given evidence against him has applied for 'hush money;' but it is still more probable that many of those who have not given evidence against him have been bought off by him. This indeed is currently reported. And although he may affect to rail at the "dishonest customs and corrupt practices of the generality of the natives in this division," I think it would be difficult to find even among a money-loaning race, such as the Hindoo proverbially are, a man in whom the curse of greed—the *rem quocunque modo rem* is more thoroughly ingrained—Vyapoory Pillay presents to me the attributes peculiar to all misers. The yearning to clutch money at all hazards, money which he has not the heart to spend, and which he is afraid to show, so that while wearing to outward appearance the air of a poor man, he can revel in secret over his ill-gained hoards, such men, however interesting to the students of human nature, are clearly unsuited for situations of trust under a Government who expect, and have a right to claim, common honesty and integrity of purpose from those individuals whom they may be pleased to select for positions such as that in which the Pillay was placed.

---

No. 494. From the same officer, dated Madura, 15th April 1872, No. 182.

Letter from the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate, Tinnevelly, with one Enclosure.

In reference to G. O. of the 22nd March 1872, No. 200, I have the honour to forward herewith a letter No. 26, dated the 8th instant, from the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate of the Tinnevelly District, furnishing the accompanying copy of register of preliminary inquiry held before him in regard to the alleged misconduct of Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay.

---

No. 495. Order thereon, 31st May 1872, No. 1,355.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 51.

In paragraph 5 of his letter No. 1,688, dated 15th August 1871, the Superintending Engineer of the 8th Division brought to notice the utterly untrustworthy character and unfitness for the management of his range of Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay, and reported that the roads, tanks, and irrigation works generally in the 4th Range of the Tinnevelly District, of which the Supervisor held charge, had much deteriorated, and were falling into rapid decay, and that Government money was being diverted from its allotted channels. Orders were accordingly issued for the submission of a special report in support of these allegations.

Paragraph 3 of G. O., No. 2,401, dated 20th September 1871.

2. In compliance with these instructions, the Superintending Engineer has instituted a lengthy and laborious inquiry into the misconduct of the Supervisor, and with the first of his letters* above recorded he forwards the result for the consideration and orders of Government.

* No. 4,195, dated 30th January 1872.

3. The specific charges—twenty-seven in number—which have been preferred against the Supervisor, are succinctly stated in enclosure No. 40 to the Superintending Engineer's letter, and comprise the levying of a percentage from contractors on the amounts of contracts, mis-appropriation of Government property and funds, falsification of accounts, neglect of duty, mismanagement of the affairs of the range, and general dishonesty. Vyapoory Pillay's depositions* are also submitted, together with the report† of Mr. Sub-Engineer McNair who conducted the inquiry, under the orders of the Executive Engineer Mr. Sage, and the review‡ of the Superintending Engineer containing seriatim remarks on the several accusations.

* Enclosure No. 36.
† Enclosure No. 51.
‡ Enclosure No. 81.

4. Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts points out* that owing to the irregular manner in which the depositions of witnesses were taken down by Mr. Sage, much information of a damaging character to the Supervisor, which would otherwise have been elicited, has been suppressed, and he states that had Mr. McNair been left to conduct the investigation independently of Mr. Sage's arrangements and supervision the result would have been more satisfactory, and would probably have been such as would ensure a Magisterial conviction being obtained for the frauds in connection with the buttresses† to the Sattoor bridge and the buildings‡ at Vellaticolum. Lieutenant-Colonel Roberts expresses his entire dissent from the favourable view of the Supervisor's case entertained by Mr. Sage, and he forwards three petitions§ suggestive of the motives which actuated Mr. Sage in forming his opinion.

* Letter No. 4,195, dated 30th January 1872.
† Charge No. 2.
‡ " " 8.
§ Enclosures Nos. 76, 77, and 78.

5. Although the evidence elicited on the charges brought forward by the Superintending Engineer against Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay is not so conclusive as it might apparently have been made, and the judicial inquiry into charges Nos. 1 and 13 did not result in his committal for trial for want of sufficient evidence, the Government cannot but take severe notice of his undoubted irregularities and neglect, and resolve that he shall be degraded to the bottom of the list

of Supervisors, below Mr. Supervisor Crowe, and transferred to do duty in the 7th Division in charge of the Cundapore Range of South Canara, which he will proceed to join without delay.

6. It is a matter of regret that Mr. Sub-Engineer McNair was not left to conduct the investigations entirely unfettered, or that the Executive Engineer Mr. Sage did not require all evidence taken down to be recorded in the form that is usual, which would have prevented any after denial on the part of witnesses.

7. The petitions against Mr. Sage are unauthenticated, and it was therefore injudicious to bring them on the records of the Superintending Engineer's Office or to attach to them the significance which the Superintending Engineer has done by laying them before the Government.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
*Officiating Secretary to Government.*

To the Superintending Engineers, 7th and 8th Divisions.
,, Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.

No 4195

Superintg Engineer's Office 8th Dn
Madura 30 January 1872

From
Lieut: Colonel R. A. Roberts RE
Superintg Engineer 8th Dn

To
Colonel J. Carpendale RE
Secretary to Government PWD

Sir,

In obedience to the instructions contained in para 3 of G.O. dated 20 September 1871, No 2101, directing me to report specially on the alleged misconduct of Supervisor Thyagaroya Pillay, I have now the honor to submit the result of the enquiry made by Mr Sub Engineer McNair under the orders of Executive Engineer Mr G. S. Sage, together with the further investigations made by me into the same subject.

2 Attached to this letter is a

list of all the papers now forwarded; and while regretting their great number, I have no alternative but to forward them, in view to the proper understanding by the Government of this most unsatisfactory and torturous case.

3 In para 5 of my letter printed with the G.O. quoted, I have given the opinion I have formed in regard to the Supervisor, and I feel satisfied that a perusal of the accompanying papers will convince the Government that Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay has proved himself not only unfit for the position of Range Officer, but utterly untrustworthy in every way, and that on this account he is no longer deserving of being retained in the service of Government.



4 As I have in the investigation made by me, given at sufficient length my opinion (see my Report enclosure No 81) in regard to each of the charges produced against Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay, there remains but little for me to add here.

5 I have already, in my letter quoted in para 3, reported that the money of Government was being diverted from its allotted channels, and that the roads and tanks and irrigation works, generally, in the late 4th Range, already much deteriorated, were falling into rapid decay. Mr Sage has, in frequent instances, since assuming charge of the Range, corroborated this statement, and I need only allude here to the state of the cotton road and the high road from Madura

to Tinnevelly as being marked instances of the reprehensible neglect and mismanagement - to call his conduct by its least unpleasant names - evinced in this respect by the Supervisor; while the work that has been executed and paid for by him to the Vellaticolum Cutcherry and jail, and for the Buttresses of the Sattoor Bridge, clearly, to my mind, indicates fraud on the Supervisors part.-

6 The Cotton road on which a maintenance allowance of Rupees 400 per mile, for the 1st five miles from Tuticorin, has for many years been allotted, was in excellent order when Vyapoory Pillay assumed charge of the Range. Although the same allotment has been continued during his charge of the Range, the road over these miles has deteriorated to such an extent as to call for the public censure, on a recent occasion, of the Local Fund Board, and has necessitated the preparation of a supplemental and emergent estimate of Rupees 4,000, to put this portion of the road into its former state of repair.

7 In like manner with regard to the Trunk road No 2, a supplemental estimate of Rs 2,000 has just been received from the Range Officer, for sanction, for the repairs urgently required thereto, which if the maintenance allotment of Rupees 200 per mile had been bonâ fide expended on the road, as charged for, it most assuredly would not have needed.

8 It would appear, moreover,

that the conduct of the Supervisor has been so notorious in the Range that through fear, and in order to keep things quiet, he has been compelled to submit as Range Officer, to considerable irregularities and even indignities from his Office subordinates.

9. To this circumstance may be attributed the conduct of the Head Accountant, Nullasivam Pillay, and the 3d Accountant, Lalah Meah, who have behaved in an unbecoming manner towards their immediate superior, have neglected their duties, and have attended the Office when they pleased, and performed only as much work as they pleased. Highly improper as was such conduct on their parts, the Supervisor has never reported it, and appears to have been afraid to do so.

10 The Head Accountant has aided and abetted the Supervisor in altering and twice re-binding the cash book, and he (as well as the Supervisor) has concealed the fact from the Superintending Engineer and the Controller's Manager. The 3d Accountant has, with the help of his brother Sundoo Meah, forwarded anonymous or pseudonymous petitions against his immediate superior, and has also instigated others to do so. I may mention here that the Head Accountant has now been transferred by me to the Southern Range Tinnevelly.

11 It is now with extreme reluctance that I touch upon a matter which I consider it my duty to bring to the prominent

notice of Government. I refer to the highly unsatisfactory report submitted by Mr Sage, as the result of the investigations conducted under his orders in this case.-

12 Far be it from me to attribute motives, or to rely on reports, (Nos 76 to 78) but judging entirely from the facts of the case, I submit that it is simply impossible for me to understand how Mr Sage can have arrived at the favorable opinion in regard to the Supervisor, as reported in his letters Nos 165 & 216 dated 30th November and 27th December 1871 respectively (Nos 50 & 69 on the list).-

13 The manner in which the preliminary enquiry into the charges against the Supervisor was conducted by Mr Sage, viz. his not attempting to obtain the



evidence of the witnesses in a calm dignified and dispassionate manner, has resulted in a palpable failure in regard to the whole truth being elicited. That this is clearly proved, I would refer you to the statements of Head Accountant Nullasivum Pillay (A & No 71) of Talook Overseers Writer Venkatachellum Iyengar (Ly & No 72), the Superintending Engineer's letters to Mr Sage (Nos 73 & 80), Mr Sage's reply (No 74) regarding these statements and my marginal remarks thereon.-

14 When I delegated Mr McNair to the conduct of the investigation under Mr Sage's orders, I did so not only because it appeared to me that it would be unbecoming to ignore, in the investigation in question, a Range Officer of Mr Sage's length of service

note and experience, but also because
high I thought, and I had a right
subm to expect, that Mr Sage would
result have given me, and through
duce me, the Government, the benefit
this, of his calm and unprejudiced
12 assistance in such an investigation.—
to a the result has indeed been truly
ou pi unfortunate, and I feel confident,
judge judging from Mr McInnis patient
of the and thorough manner of taking
simp evidence, that had he been left
unde to conduct the enquiry independent
have of Mr Sage's arrangements and
opin supervision, the facts that would
as pe have been elicited — but which it
dated is now too late to elicit — would
1871 have been of a shle more dis:
13 paraging nature to the Supervisor
the than what has been actually the
the case; — and indeed would probably
was have been such as would have
his

ensured beyond all doubt a
Magisterial conviction being
obtained against the supervisor,
at least for the frauds which
as I have already said are to
my mind clearly proved in
the cases of the Buttresses to
Sattoor Bridge, and the buildings
at Vellaticolum.—

15 As it is, I myself feel
quite satisfied — that a conviction
can be obtained in the two instances
named against the supervisor;
but with the papers before them
the Government will be able to
form their own opinion on
this point.

16 It will be understood
therefore that I am far from
sharing Mr Sage's expressed opinion
in regard to Supervisor Vyapoory
Pillay, and after the severe

a punishment that has recently been
meted out by the Government
to members of the late 3d Orange
Jamaically for similar frauds
mismanagement and irregularities,
it would be as it appears to
me, inconsistent and indeed
monstrously unfair were no
notice, as Mr Sage suggests,
to be taken of the Supervisors
grave misconduct - to call it by
its least harsh name - in allowing
the late No 4 Range Jamaically
to sink into such a deplorable
state of neglect as to be the
scandal of the Ge W. Department.
And I feel confident therefore
that the Government will assert
their authority in this case, and
make such an escample as
will prove their determination
to put an end to the exhibition



in future of such Departmental
lâches as those under notice.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obt Servant,

Rich.d Roberts Lieut: Col: RE
Superintg Engineer 8c Dn

Comp'd

Public Works 1872 Department
Dep^t. of Yard for Bridges No 4195
From Prof^r Peirce
~~Sr.~~ 622.
The Superint^t of Engineers
& Dr.

To

The Secretary &c
Government 1872

Dated 30 January 72
Received 1 ~~m~~ Feb^y 1872

Enclosures 7 &

Report of the
alleged Misconduct
of Supervisor
Van Voorst of Albany
& No 11 Ranges
Drivers &c

No 1

No 135 S. 31 Jany 72.

No 1709 Jinnevelly 8th July 1871

From,

The Dy Collector
in charge of Treasury
Jinnevelly

To,

The Ag Superintending Engineer
8th Division

Sir,

As requested in your letter
No 1134, dated 7th instant, I have the honor
to enclose herein the letter addressed to me
by Supervisor Vyapuri Pillay on the 21st
Inst last.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servt

S. A. Sachi
Dy Collector

Comt D.S.P

4th Range Office Trinidad
21st May 1871

No. 26.

To

The Deputy Collector
In Charge of Treasury
Trinidad.

Sir,

With reference to your letter
No. 1309 of the 16th Inst. I have the
honor to state, that the sum of
Rupees 20-1-9 shown in my Pro-
-gress Report for the past Months
as Travelling allowance to Local
Fund Overseer, is for 2 Months as
per Margin.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obed. Servt.

Stephen Pitt
Supr. in Charge 4th
Range Trinidad

21-5-71 Rec.

20-1-9.
12-13-6
7-4-1.

Rupees Twenty one & annas Thirteen & pies six only.

1871
From
Mr. Supr. in Charge
4th Range
Trinidad

No. 26.

Rupees Twenty one & annas Thirteen & pies six only.

To
The Deputy Collector
In Charge of Treasury
Trinidad.

Sir,

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obed. Servt.

Stephen Pitt
Supr. in Charge 4th
Range Trinidad

Received the Letter
of Stephen Pitt Esqr
as noted in the
margin.

No 491.

Trin. 15 Feby 72 R. 14 Transfer

4th Range Office Limavady
Garrigoonduff 15th May 67

No 24.

To

The Superintending Engineer
8th Division -

Sir,

I beg to report for your information that I have this day re-assumed Charge of my Range from 6 days' Casual Leave granted to me in your Memo of the 5th Inst. No 337-

I beg &c
Jno Brown Pdl
Sub. 4th Range
Limavdy

20 897

P. W. 622/72

Tuesday 72 L D

Salam Station
5th May 1871.

No 338

No 15.

The Supervisor
in charge of No 4 Range
Timewelly is requested to
expedite the despatch of
the Register of Lands
called for in Circular No 87
dated 6th April 1871, and
to state marginally when
the Register may be expected
in this Office.

Rich[d] Roberts Lt Col RE
A[g] Sup[g] Engineer
8th Div[n]

The Register of
Lands called for in this
memo is hereunto enclosed.

Sd/- Jno Pilton
Supg 4th Range
Timewelly

4th Range Office Timewelly
Parao this dun 20th May 1871.

No 24/
159.

From
The 4th Range Officer
Timewelly

To
The Supg Engineer
8th Division

Dated 15th
Received 5th May 1871

Enclosure None

Reports of his having resumed Charge of his Range from 6 days Casual leave granted to him on the 5th May 1871.

Read.

Thom. Hall Manse Office
Sinnerly
No 25.

Dated 20th
Recd 22d. January 71.

Forwarded to
Register of Lands
called for in Memo
No 320. 5th January 71

No 27.

From

Lieut 4th Range Officer
Tsinanthi.

To The Superintendent
of Darjeeling.

Dated 22nd
Rec'd 26: 3/3 May 1871

Enclosure none.

Enclosure from

P. W. 622/72.

Transmitting No 2 Abstract.

Reports that his 2nd
Accountant Narrayan
-sawmy Pillay has join-
-ed the Head Quarters
at Sattiss on the 19th
May 1871.

Recd 63

No 119

To

4th Range Office Tsinghi
Sattiss, 19th July 1871.

The Supt Engineer
& Conservator.

Sir,

With reference
to your memo No 1132 of the
4th instant I most res
pectfully beg to bring to
your notice that on the
2nd May last I was at
Sattiss whence I prepared
the Rough letter to the
2nd Range Officer Tsinan
-illy & entered thereon
Sattiss as my Station
without entering the
date but as the Re
-mittance Roll of the
Village round Sabugi
Onions in which should
have been sent along
with it not having
been

been received by that
date I took the Letter
with me to Keyhaven where
I compared our Abstract
of the Acquittance Roll
in question with the
in my hands at Keyhaven
I immediately forwarded
the Letter but there on
overnight the Station
has not been settled
2. By original Letters
from Nos 24 to 29 Inclusive
their respective Stations
entered therein having
owing to some inadver-
tence or other this Letter
was not entered in
the Office Copies & which
shall not occur again.

I beg &c.

Jas Thompson Pte
Supervisor in Ch
of the Ringwood Ring.

No 165. Northern Range Office
Corripotty

From

The Executive Engineer
in Charge of Range
Northern Range
Tunapuna

To

The Superintending Engineer
8th Division

Sir,

I have the honor to forward a Memo with Documents, being the result of enquiries made by myself and Mr. Sinclair into the Charges made against Supervisor Upapuri Pillay, and to offer a few Remarks on the Contents of Memo.—

2. On his remarks on Charge No 2 Mr. Sinclair states, as the result of your Examination of the Latter Ridge Buttresses he states that the Mortar contains a larger proportion of Sand than necessary, I have the honor to this Conclusion— I do not know on this first Remark on looking at the work was "how well the Mortar has set" which would not have been the case with excess of Sand in it.

3 With reference to concluding Remark of Mr. Sinclair on Charge No 1— I do not agree with him— I have always found the greatest difficulty in making Natives of

From The Officer in charge Latter Ridge, Range Tunapuna

To

The Supt. Engr. 8th Div.

Dated 19th July 1871
Recd

Enclosure — — — None
P. W. 622/72.

Affords his explanation regarding certain discrepancies pointed out in Returns in his letter Book & Inspection Report

Answered 31st May 1872 in B.B. 5480

any Class or standing understands
the necessity of full particulars
& extreme accuracy in preparing
these Inspection Reports and beyond
that & stating this explanation
with use I Considered there are no
grounds for stating the Reports of
the Inspector Cannot be relied on
as Regarding Charge No 13 I am
of opinion from my own Enquiries
on the subject that the re-writing
of Cash book was done in
order to show a clear book to
Controller, as the other had many
Corrections, & not from any fraudulent
intentions

In With the above remarks
I agree with the Statement in
the Memo, and may state that I
shall be very glad if you will
permit Captain Pilley to remain
in Northern Range as Latter Sub
Pincum Officer, I would further
state that I have found every
readiness on the part of the Inspector
to Serve, and ability to produce,
explanations Regarding works or
Repairs which it has been necessary
for me to Call for since I have
been in Charge of the Range—

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed. Servt
Gillie Ewen Esqr

No 165

From Officer in charge
Northern Range
Immovable Debts
To The Superintendent of Imprisonment
Madras

Dated 31 Dec 1873
Rec'd

Recd. 5/6
P. W. 622/72.
Forwards report on enquiry made into charges against Vyapoory Pillay

Rec. 2 Jany 74 Ln B 2491.

No 52

21.A

My dear Roberts.

I send the enclosed for your information. Some thing should be done to purge the Ry. case I think. Vyapuri Pillai has I know amassed property & has two fine houses built together at Vanarapettah near where I live & has built recently a large house at Saturbinely a large house at Saturbinely The Nursery garden there is I know merely his vegetable garden and his care of the Nursery

and Gungundam channel banks somewhat bears out what the petitioner says. The wells & topes along the road 18 in number that were under his care have been sadly neglected and the condition of the trunk road you know - with reference to the stones - all or many of the Irish bridges have been dug up & stones built. the stones are lying about - would it not be better to collect them or at all events

register them, as they are a valuable property. hoping to see you on the 1st between us

Yrs sincerely

R K Pechell

Manjachi
July 25.

P. W. 62

Rs. 21-4-0 Rs. 21-4-0

12

No. 25 TALUQ TASK WORK. 23

Received from the Officer in charge of 6th Range Trincomalee
Rupees (26-11-6) Twenty-six, Annas Eleven & pice six
for the payment of 190 Linial yards of Palmirah
rafting at 2½ As per Rd. for the construction
of a Revenue Office at Sittan-
ai

25th February 1869

Rs. 0-8

No. 44

Tinnevelly.

Voucher for Payment of

work done to the Range

for the month of

1869.

Tallum

Range

Tinnevelly.

Salary Task work.

No 44

Received from the Officer in charge of the Range Tallum Tinnevelly Rupees (97-4-0) Ninety seven Rupees four annas for the payment of 100 cart loads of Rough stones at 4 as per load, 30 Cottahs of Chunam at 1 Rupee per Cottah, 10 Bricklayers at 12 as, 24 at 10 as, 15 at 6 as, 29 Coolies at 3 as & 4 pies each, 33 Boys at 2 as & Sundries for the construction of a Range Office at Tallum-

29th March 1869.

B.J.

No 62 Salary Sash work

Received from the Officer in charge of 4 ½ Rupees
Thirtyseven Rupees (104-4-4) One hundred & four
for the payment of 7000 Pan tiles ab Rs 4-8-4 per
1000, 2500 flat tiles ab Rs 3 per 1000, 2 Windows
ab Rs 6 each, 120 Rafters ab Rs 1-4-4 per 20,
7 Cft. of wood, ab Rs 3 per Cft. 12 Carpenters
ab 12 as 4 8 ab. 2 as 4 three of Rs 2 Carts from Tale-
-cavu to Sattur ab Rs 3 Rs each for the Con-
-struction of Civil Judge Office ab Sattur-

30 March 1869.

Government Press

No 73 Taluq Sasta Work -

Received from the Officer in Charge of 4th Ramp Ini-
-mually Rupees (102-4-6) One hundred and two,
annas four & pies six for the payment of 20 Cottah,
of Chunam ak 1 Rupee, 20 Carts ak 12 as, 4000
Bricks ak 3 Rs per 1000, 8 lbs of Nails ak 4 as
per lb, 16 Bricklayers ak 12 as each, 16 ak
10 as & 6 ak 6 as, 40 Coolies ak 3 as & 4 pies,
40 Boys ak 2 as, 16 Carpenters ak 10 as and
Sundries Rs 5-11-2 for the construction of a
Ramp Office ak Sattur -

Sattur
31st March 1869

RECEIVED

any class or standing understand
to all particulars

Detailed Estimate No 1 of 1868/69 [illegible]
District Kinneneldy Value Contractors
for Constructing 3d Class Range Office for the use
the 4th Ranger Office in Kinneneldy District

| Particulars of Work | | Measurements Length | Breadth | Height | Quantity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Foundations to walls of Room | Rough dressing Clay | 54 | 3 | 1½ | 243 |
| Do Do | | 54 | 2½ | 1½ | 202½ |
| Do to Verandah | | 16½ | 3 | 1¼ | 61⅞ |
| Do Do | | 16 | 2½ | 1¼ | 50 |
| Basement to Room | | 54 | 2 | 1½ | 162 |
| Do to Verandah | | 15½ | 2 | 1 | 31 |
| Do to 2 ends of Do | Rough | 10½ | 1½ | 1½ | 23⅝ |
| Walls above | ay Jetty Stone | 54 | 1½ | 12 | 972 |
| Pillars | | 6 | 1½ | 7½ | 67½ |
| Gable walls | in Chunam | 12 | 1¼ | 4½ | 67½ |
| Steps | | 4 | 1 | ½ | 2 |
| Flooring to Room | | 11½ | 11½ | ½ | 66⅛ |
| Do to Verandah | | 12 | 6¼ | ½ | 37½ |
| Cornice | Brick in Chunam | 45 | 5/8 | ¾ | 21 3/32 |
| | | | | | 2007 23/32 |
| Deduct for doorway | | 8 | 4 | 1½ | 48 |
| Do for Windows | | 5 | 3 | 1½ | 22½ |
| | | | | | 70½ |
| Remaining Effect | | | | | 1937 1/32 |
| Viz Rough Stone in Clay Cft | | | | | 557 3/8 |
| Do in Chunam Do | | | | | 1358 3/4 |
| Brick in Chunam Do | | | | | 21 3/32 |
| Wall Plates | | 27 | ¼ | ⅜ | 2 17/32 |

Abstract Estimate No^r of 1868/69

District Tinnevelly Taluk Sankar

Work Constructing a 3^d Class Range Office for the use of the 4^th Range Office in Tinnevelly District

| Quantities | Descriptions of Charges | Rate | | | Amount | | | Total | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 557 3/8 | Cft^s in 20 17 3/8 / 27 Cyd^s Rough stone in clay @ | 1 | 12 | 0 | 36 | 2 | 0 | | | |
| 1358 3/4 | Cft^s in 50 8 3/4 / 27 Cyd^s Rough stone in Chunam @ | 2 | 12 | 0 | 138 | 6 | 3 | | | |
| 21 3/32 | Cft^s Bricks in Chunam @ per Cyd^s | 5 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 6 | | | |
| 8 2 1/2 / 16 | Cft^s of wood @ | 2 | 8 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 3 | | | |
| 450 | Sq^re feet of Roofing with Palmyrah rafters, reapers, Nails, Pankles Chunam borders ^&c^ Complete @ | 14 | 0 | 0 | 63 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 8' x 4' | Pair Venedoors with frames Hooks, hinges, bolts, ^&c^ Complete | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| 5' X 3' | Window with iron bars ^&c^ Complete | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 293 | 13 | 0 |
| | Excavating foundation, filling basement, painting Masonry, & Sundries | | | | | | | 21 | 3 | 0 |
| | Superintendence | | | | | | | 15 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total amount of Estimate | | | | | | | 330 | 0 | 0 |

Supt^d Engr^s Office 8^th Div^n
Madura 7^th September 1868

(Signed) C. J. Welkeson Coll^t R.E.
Superintending Engineer 8^th Div^n

(True copy)
Chas Sandys Lt.
Capt^n R.E.
Ex-Engineer in Ch^g of Supt^d Engr^s Office
8^th Division

No 71

Gl Charge Dy Mag[te] 6th Jan[y]
Sattur 20th November 1871

29

From

The General Charge Dy Mag[te]
Tinnevelly

To

The Superintending Engineer,
Madura & Tinnevelly
8th Division

Sir,

With reference to your letter of 27th July 1871 No 1419 requesting me to institute an enquiry into a Charge preferred by one Alagiri Naik against Vyapuri Pillai Supervisor in Charge of 4th Range Tinnevelly of illegal retention, on the Supervisor's part of a Sum of Rupees 200 paid by the Petitioner as a Contribution towards the execution of a certain Public work, I have the honor to inform you that upon the receipt of your letter I sent for the Petitioner and took a deposition.

2. He stated in his deposition that he paid the Sum of 200 Rupees to Vyapuri Pillai 5 years ago, in the presence of Gopal Naik, Cugal Naik, Cavalé Narayanan, and Arumugam Pillai, as a Contribution for lowering the Calingulah, in Theruthangal Poor Kal [illegible] Sattur Taluk. that

he promised to write to the higher authorities & obtain sanction & get the work done; that the Petitioner one month after, went in Company with Arumugam Pillai & enquired, as to why the work was not done, & was informed that orders had not been received; that three months after the payment, Range Officer's writers Lalamia Saib and Venkatasamie Iyer measured the tank & prepared a plan & estimate, for reducing the level of the Kaliyulah; that four months after payment, he again went with Arumugam Pillai & demanded that either the work should be executed, or the money refunded; that Vijapuri Pillai gave the same reply as before; that they afterwards made frequent demands and met with similar excuses & that the last demand, for Refund, was made two months before the date of his deposition or about the 15th June last, when Vijapuri Pillai ordered the Petitioner to be put out.

3. Owing to the long term elapsed in preferring the charge in this case, I thought that a preliminary enquiry should be made, to ascertain whether

there are sufficient grounds to justify the summoning of the accused person and therefore, I sent an order to the Sub Magte of Sattur to ascertain whether the Witnesses named by the Petitioner were likely to support the Petitioner's allegations and the Tahsildar Singara Iyengar reported on the 23rd August, that of the 4 persons cited to prove the payment, two Viz Engal Naik & Narayanan denied all Knowledge of the matter & that the other two Witnesses, who deposed to the fact of payment, were untrustworthy

4. On the same date Petitioner forwarded a Petition to me by post, complaining that the Tahsildar had used threats towards him & his Witnesses, that in consequence, the two Witnesses, referred to above, denied their Knowledge & that the Range officer's office servants had been bribed. He further stated that before receiving the money from him, Vijapuri Pillai furnished an autograph draft to him; & that after the receipt of the money he instructed his office servants Lalamiah & Venkatasalam Iyengar Surveyor and [illegible] of the

x These servants denied all knowledge of any demand by Petitioner.

plan to Petitioner. On the 28th August the Petitioner produced a sum of money tied in his cloth stating it to be Rupees 110- paid to him on behalf of Vyapuri Pillai by one Devakannu Pillai who promised to pay the balance of Rs 90 on Petitioner's denying the transmission of the above Petition by post & on the 28th of September he produced the draft as well as the copy of the plan referred to.

5 On perusing the Correspondence received from your office on the subject of the Calingulah, I find that in a letter dated 28th August 1868, addressed by Vyapuri Pillai to the Superintending Engineer, he has reported that the late District Engineer Major Paxton had, upon examination of the spot on a petition, declined to interfere in the matter; that similar petitions were presented to every successive Engineer with the same result; that to the best of his knowledge, the Calingulah in question was constructed upwards of 20 years before; that, were the Calingulah lowered, the whole of

short of water & the Ryots suffer Considerable loss every year & that the tank in its then state could not hold sufficient quantity of water to bring the Crop to maturity & the Government passed an order on the 17th September 1868 stating that they saw no reason for interference by the Department of Public Works. The Petitioner must, I presume, have been aware of this order although he denies that any Communication was made to him, on the subject. Were it true as that he paid a sum of Rs 200 to Vyapuri Pillai, as a Contribution for the work, on his promise of getting it executed, it is strange that he never made mention of it in any of his Petitions to the Higher authority as it would have been a strong support for his prayer for lowering the Calingulah. He moreover failed to bring to my notice the circumstance, when the subject of lowering the Calingulah, was under enquiry in my Office from December 1866 to November 1868, when both parties entered into a Compromise, that the Calingulah was to remain as it was. Also it is the Lower C.

not have had any further hope of Vyapuri Pillai fulfilling his promise of getting the Calingalah lowered &, yet till 3 years after, he remained silent without bringing to public notice, either the alleged payment of money to Vyapuri Pillai, or his failure to refund. These circumstances tell strongly against Petitioners allegation & therefore I do not see sufficient grounds for summoning Vyapuri Pillai to answer the charge preferred against him especially after such laches on the part of the Petitioner.-

From the draft produced before me of a Petition stated to have been presented by Petitioners Vakil on 30th March 1863, it appears that the 8th paragraph as originally written therein was struck out & the alleged autograph draft substituted, supplying certain information wanting, as regards the extent of Ayacut &c., and the Petitioner has stated in his Petition, presented to the late Acting Head Assistant Collector Mr Harsebrough in December 1866, that an agraish was made by order of the Collr. & officer upon a Petition preferred by Vyapuri Pillai. [illegible]

Petitioner & in support of this assertion, a plan wearing the appearance of having been prepared by Office Servants, has been produced by the Petitioner. If the autograph draft is a genuine one, it merely shews the connection of Vyapuri Pillai with the Petitioner, so far back as 1863. Under what circumstances, the copy of the plan or the alleged autograph draft came into Petitioner's hands, may, perhaps be a matter for departmental enquiry but are immaterial to the present investigation. I have therefore the honor to return the correspondence received with your letter of 22nd August 1878 to transmit the proceedings held before me & the Sub Magistrate of Pattur.-

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servt
T Venkatrow
Deputy Magistrate

No.
3176 Forwarded to the Secretary

I have written Name Generally for
inquiry & report into the petitioner as to how the
copy of the Plan & the alleged Autograph draft
came into Petitioner's hands, as mentioned in
Para. 6. of this Report.

2. The undersigned after a perusal of these papers
has little doubt of the truth of the Petitioner's
statements, although there may not be sufficient
evidence to bring the matter to a conviction. It is
all the more necessary therefore that a careful
inquiry should be made of this Dept. into the subject
& Mr Page's report will be awaited before the
undersigned takes any action in this matter.

Calcutta
21 Nov. 1871

Richd. Strachey
Actg. Secy. to Govt.
Legislative Dept.

No. 3176 Home Department
Legislative
Dated 24th Nov. 1871
35

Forwarded for information
Copy of Petition Records
Testimonials, Abstract
&
Statement
&
Plan

By accidental circumstances, which occurred in June last, I was led to suspect that a Plan of the Town of Nuddea, which was then in the possession of the Executive Engineer, Nuddea, was the identical Plan which I had prepared in 1857 for the Municipal Commissioners of Nuddea, and which had been lost sight of for many years.

2 — The Municipal Records, however, were searched, but no trace of the Plan could be found.

3 — Search was then made in the Public Offices, and the Plan was found in the Bengal Secretariat Office, where it had been deposited by Mr. Beadon, C.S.I., when Secretary to the Government of Bengal, in 1857. It is marked "Plan of Nuddea, surveyed by Baboo Kallachand Mitter, Municipal Commissioner, 1857." It is the identical Plan which I had prepared for the Municipality.

Subjoined is a list of documents:—

A — Petition to Lieutenant Governor, dated 21st June 1871.

B — Letter from Executive Engineer, Nuddea, to Commissioner of Division, dated 12th June 1871.

C — Letter from Commissioner of Division to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 28th June 1871.

D — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 29th July 1871.

E — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 2nd August 1871.

F — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 5th August 1871.

G — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 8th August 1871.

H — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 14th August 1871.

I — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 16th August 1871.

J — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 19th August 1871.

K — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 21st August 1871.

L — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 24th August 1871.

M — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 25th August 1871.

N — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 28th August 1871.

O — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 29th August 1871.

P — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 31st August 1871.

Q — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 1st September 1871.

R — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 4th September 1871.

S — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 5th September 1871.

T — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 7th September 1871.

U — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 8th September 1871.

V — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 11th September 1871.

W — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 12th September 1871.

X — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 14th September 1871.

Y — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 15th September 1871.

Z — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 18th September 1871.

A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 19th September 1871.

B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 21st September 1871.

C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 22nd September 1871.

D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 25th September 1871.

E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 26th September 1871.

F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 28th September 1871.

G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 29th September 1871.

H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 2nd October 1871.

I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 3rd October 1871.

J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 5th October 1871.

K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 6th October 1871.

L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 9th October 1871.

M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 10th October 1871.

N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 12th October 1871.

O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 13th October 1871.

P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 16th October 1871.

Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 17th October 1871.

R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 20th October 1871.

S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 21st October 1871.

T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 23rd October 1871.

U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 24th October 1871.

V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 26th October 1871.

W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 27th October 1871.

X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 29th October 1871.

Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 30th October 1871.

Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 1st November 1871.

A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 2nd November 1871.

B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 3rd November 1871.

C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 4th November 1871.

D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 6th November 1871.

E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 7th November 1871.

F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 9th November 1871.

G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 10th November 1871.

H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 12th November 1871.

I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 13th November 1871.

J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 15th November 1871.

K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 16th November 1871.

L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 18th November 1871.

M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 19th November 1871.

N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 21st November 1871.

O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 22nd November 1871.

P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 24th November 1871.

Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 25th November 1871.

R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 27th November 1871.

S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 28th November 1871.

T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 30th November 1871.

U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 1st December 1871.

V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 3rd December 1871.

W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 4th December 1871.

X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 6th December 1871.

Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 7th December 1871.

Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 9th December 1871.

A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 10th December 1871.

B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 12th December 1871.

C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 13th December 1871.

D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 15th December 1871.

E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 16th December 1871.

F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 18th December 1871.

G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 19th December 1871.

H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 21st December 1871.

I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 22nd December 1871.

J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 24th December 1871.

K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 25th December 1871.

L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 27th December 1871.

M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 28th December 1871.

N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 30th December 1871.

O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 31st December 1871.

P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 1st January 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 2nd January 1872.

R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 4th January 1872.

S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 5th January 1872.

T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 7th January 1872.

U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 8th January 1872.

V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 10th January 1872.

W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 11th January 1872.

X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 13th January 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 14th January 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 16th January 1872.

A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 17th January 1872.

B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 19th January 1872.

C.C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 20th January 1872.

D.D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 22nd January 1872.

E.E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 23rd January 1872.

F.F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 25th January 1872.

G.G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 26th January 1872.

H.H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 28th January 1872.

I.I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 29th January 1872.

J.J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 31st January 1872.

K.K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 1st February 1872.

L.L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 3rd February 1872.

M.M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 4th February 1872.

N.N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 6th February 1872.

O.O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 7th February 1872.

P.P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 9th February 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 10th February 1872.

R.R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 12th February 1872.

S.S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 13th February 1872.

T.T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 15th February 1872.

U.U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 16th February 1872.

V.V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 18th February 1872.

W.W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 19th February 1872.

X.X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 21st February 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 22nd February 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 24th February 1872.

A.A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 25th February 1872.

B.B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 27th February 1872.

C.C.C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 28th February 1872.

D.D.D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 1st March 1872.

E.E.E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 2nd March 1872.

F.F.F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 4th March 1872.

G.G.G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 5th March 1872.

H.H.H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 7th March 1872.

I.I.I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 8th March 1872.

J.J.J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 10th March 1872.

K.K.K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 11th March 1872.

L.L.L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 13th March 1872.

M.M.M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 14th March 1872.

N.N.N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 16th March 1872.

O.O.O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 17th March 1872.

P.P.P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 19th March 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 20th March 1872.

R.R.R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 22nd March 1872.

S.S.S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 23rd March 1872.

T.T.T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 25th March 1872.

U.U.U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 26th March 1872.

V.V.V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 28th March 1872.

W.W.W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 29th March 1872.

X.X.X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 31st March 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 1st April 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 3rd April 1872.

A.A.A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 4th April 1872.

B.B.B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 6th April 1872.

C.C.C.C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 7th April 1872.

D.D.D.D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 9th April 1872.

E.E.E.E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 10th April 1872.

F.F.F.F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 12th April 1872.

G.G.G.G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 13th April 1872.

H.H.H.H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 15th April 1872.

I.I.I.I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 16th April 1872.

J.J.J.J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 18th April 1872.

K.K.K.K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 19th April 1872.

L.L.L.L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 21st April 1872.

M.M.M.M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 22nd April 1872.

N.N.N.N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 24th April 1872.

O.O.O.O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 25th April 1872.

P.P.P.P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 27th April 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 28th April 1872.

R.R.R.R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 30th April 1872.

S.S.S.S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 1st May 1872.

T.T.T.T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 3rd May 1872.

U.U.U.U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 4th May 1872.

V.V.V.V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 6th May 1872.

W.W.W.W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 7th May 1872.

X.X.X.X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 9th May 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 10th May 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 12th May 1872.

A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 13th May 1872.

B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 15th May 1872.

C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 16th May 1872.

D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 18th May 1872.

E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 19th May 1872.

F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 21st May 1872.

G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 22nd May 1872.

H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 24th May 1872.

I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 25th May 1872.

J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 27th May 1872.

K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 28th May 1872.

L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 30th May 1872.

M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 31st May 1872.

N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 1st June 1872.

O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 3rd June 1872.

P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 5th June 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 6th June 1872.

R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 8th June 1872.

S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 9th June 1872.

T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 11th June 1872.

U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 12th June 1872.

V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 14th June 1872.

W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 15th June 1872.

X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 17th June 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 18th June 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 20th June 1872.

A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 21st June 1872.

B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 23rd June 1872.

C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 24th June 1872.

D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 26th June 1872.

E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 27th June 1872.

F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 29th June 1872.

G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 30th June 1872.

H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 2nd July 1872.

I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 3rd July 1872.

J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 5th July 1872.

K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 6th July 1872.

L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 8th July 1872.

M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 9th July 1872.

N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 11th July 1872.

O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 12th July 1872.

P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 14th July 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 15th July 1872.

R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 17th July 1872.

S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 18th July 1872.

T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 20th July 1872.

U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 21st July 1872.

V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 23rd July 1872.

W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 24th July 1872.

X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 26th July 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 27th July 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 29th July 1872.

A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 30th July 1872.

B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 1st August 1872.

C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 2nd August 1872.

D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 4th August 1872.

E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 5th August 1872.

F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 7th August 1872.

G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 8th August 1872.

H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 10th August 1872.

I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 11th August 1872.

J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 13th August 1872.

K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 14th August 1872.

L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 16th August 1872.

M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 17th August 1872.

N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 19th August 1872.

O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 20th August 1872.

P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 22nd August 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 23rd August 1872.

R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 25th August 1872.

S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 26th August 1872.

T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 28th August 1872.

U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 29th August 1872.

V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 31st August 1872.

W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 1st September 1872.

X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 3rd September 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 4th September 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 6th September 1872.

A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 7th September 1872.

B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 9th September 1872.

C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 10th September 1872.

D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 12th September 1872.

E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 13th September 1872.

F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 15th September 1872.

G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 16th September 1872.

H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 18th September 1872.

I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 19th September 1872.

J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 21st September 1872.

K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 22nd September 1872.

L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 24th September 1872.

M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 25th September 1872.

N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 27th September 1872.

O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 28th September 1872.

P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 30th September 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 1st October 1872.

R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 3rd October 1872.

S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 4th October 1872.

T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 6th October 1872.

U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 7th October 1872.

V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 9th October 1872.

W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 10th October 1872.

X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 12th October 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 13th October 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 15th October 1872.

A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 16th October 1872.

B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 18th October 1872.

C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C.C. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 19th October 1872.

D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D.D. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 21st October 1872.

E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E.E. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 22nd October 1872.

F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F.F. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 24th October 1872.

G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G.G. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 25th October 1872.

H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H.H. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 27th October 1872.

I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I.I. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 28th October 1872.

J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J.J. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 30th October 1872.

K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K.K. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 31st October 1872.

L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L.L. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 1st November 1872.

M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M.M. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 3rd November 1872.

N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N.N. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 5th November 1872.

O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O.O. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 6th November 1872.

P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P.P. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 8th November 1872.

Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q.Q. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 9th November 1872.

R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R.R. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 11th November 1872.

S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S.S. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 12th November 1872.

T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T.T. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 14th November 1872.

U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U.U. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 15th November 1872.

V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V.V. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 17th November 1872.

W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W.W. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 18th November 1872.

X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X.X. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 20th November 1872.

Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y.Y. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 21st November 1872.

Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z.Z. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 23rd November 1872.

A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A.A. — Letter from Petitioner to Secretary to Government of Bengal, dated 24th November 1872.

B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B.B. — Letter from Secretary to Government of Bengal to Petitioner, dated 26th November 1872.

C.C.C.C.

34

did not know it had been going.
5— The adjournment to Tuesday next
as the Deputy Magistrate says
a very suspicious circumstance
on part of Allegheny branches,
& Shelesie is only a very common
native dodge, to overwhelm a
man who would not (& his official
reports prove it) bend himself to
them, who knows they should be very
glad to get it over, that he may be safe to
hedge.
I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient humble Servant
Peter Hughes
Esqr Engineer

[illegible]
thickness

Office, & given by him to the
Commanding Officer

Madura
18th January 1872

To

The Superintending Engineer
8th Division

Sir,

I have the honor to report that agreeably to your orders I inspected the Sub Magistrate's Katcheri and Subsidiary Jail at Velathicolam, on the 11th instant.

2 The Plan and Vouchers connected with the Building not having been received by me from Mr. Sage Executive Engineer up to the time of my leaving Velathicolam, I was unable to compare the works executed with the above documents but I beg to state that the Building has been constructed in an unsatisfactory manner.

The walls of the main building and out offices are cracked in very many places, the result of defective work, the bricks not being properly bonded together, and the chunam joints between them varying from 1/2 to 1/4 inches in thickness

Rec'd 21st Jan 72
Executive Engineer
Madura

Rec'd 20th Jan 72
Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division

Rec'd 22nd Jan 72
Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division

Respectfully referred to the Executive Engineer Tinnevelly Division with request that the defects noticed may be rectified.

Superintending Engineer

P.R. 629/72.

Rec'd 24th Jan 72
Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division

thickness- The flooring of the Verandah all round of the main building is constructed of 9" square bricks laid over a bed of mere fine coral 4 inches in depth, instead of the square bricks being laid with 3 inches of stone Concrete in Chunam underneath, as provided in the Sanctioned Estimate and charged for in the Bill- The surface of the square bricks is already much worn away and very uneven- The Roof of the Cook room has moreover sagged to such an extent that unless rebuilt it will soon tumble down- The Chunam borders on the roofs of the Out Offices especially are very rough and unsightly-

The Materials used in the Buildings are also of a very inferior description- Most of the small bricks, flooring bricks, slab and jaw tiles are but half burnt, and the Chunam is so very bad that although executed more than a year ago it has not set as yet and is crumbling away- Samples of these materials are herewith forwarded- The bricks and tiles were obtained from a distance of 1½ miles and the Chunam 4 miles from the work spot-

The wood for the buildings was obtained from Tuticorin a distance of 40 miles, and the Palmyra Rafters from Tuticorin 25 miles These are of a tolerably good description-

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient Servant
D. McNair
Sub Engineer

No 73

Sup.g Engineers Office 8th Div.
Aladdin 18th January/1872

No 4011.

From
Lieut. Colonel R.M. Roberts R.E.
Superint.g Engineer 8th Div.

To
G. S. Sage Esqre
Executive Engineer, Southern
Range, Limavaddy.

Sir
In reference to your letter No 216,
dated 24th December 1871, reporting upon
the charge of bribery, alleged against
Superintendent Pyahony Pillay, I have the
honor to state that on hearing that
the statement therein enclosed as that
of Mallaviarayan Pillay, is not signed, I
called on the Accountant to sign it. He
refuses however to do so unassisted as
he declares that that statement
is not in accordance with his depos-

Enclosure 4.
Statement of Mallaviarayan Pyahony Pillay, Statement
etc. Statement of Mallaviarayan Pyahony Pillay, Statement
do. Varadarajulu Chinnaya Pillay, Statement

P.W. 622/72.

70

:tion before you.

2. I have now taken his deposition and enclose it for your perusal and for such explanation as you wish to offer on the subject.

3. The Taluq Overseers Writer Venkat:achellum Iyengar also depose that the statement forwarded by you as his evidence is not complete and does correctly represented. On being asked why under these circumstances he had signed it, he replied that he asked your permission to read it over before signing it, but that you refused either to let him see it or to read it out to him, as you informed him that you had written down what he had said. And that you threatened to send him to the Magistrate if he did not sign it. He was thus forced to sign it.

4. As this is very serious allegation I directed the Iyengar to make his deposition on oath before a Magistrate. This he has now done, and his deposition on oath together with that received from you are herewith forwarded for such explanation as you may wish to offer thereon.

5. The 4 enclosures of this letter should be returned with your reply, which it is requested may be furnished at an early date.

I have &c.

(Signed) R.A. Roberts. Lieut.Col.R.E.
Supt. Engineer &c. &c.

(True Copy)

Richd. Roberts Lieut.Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer &c. &c.

Comps PS

P. P. 622/72.

Memorandum 28

Of the 8 Petitions, containing the 26 Charges as per accompanying List, against Superintendent Vyapoory Pillai, 1 is Anonymous, 6 bear fictitious names; and 1 is from Swa-Sabramania Pillai of Jaffna, who acknowledges it to be his. The writers of the 6 petitions bearing the fictitious names of Ramasamy of Manatchi, Arunachellum of Gollapitte, and Veloyadum respectively, are not forthcoming, tho' the Assistant of Jaffna invited such persons, if any, to come forward. A bazaarman of Gollapitte, named Arunachellum Pillai, and a person named Veloyadum, who is employed as a Coomastah in the Office of the Transit Company at Jaffna, were sent for and questioned, but they denied all knowledge of the petitions, or of the

charges contained in them-
The only Complainant, therefore,
who has come forward is
Siva Subramania Pillai of
Satur who, as will be seen
from his deposition given in
the presence of the Tassildar,
was merely a tool in the
hands of the subordinates
of the Rouge Office - He states
that the English petition was
written for him by Shunda
mukh, the brother of the 3d
Accountant Lalah Mukh
and that he was instigated
to write it by the Head
Accountant Nullasamia Pillai,
3d Accountant Lalah Mukh,
and Salay Avesseu's late
writer Venkadachellum
Iyengar, who assured
him that the five charges
mentioned in it were true,
and that they were prepared
to prove them by the Accounts
in the Office -
In the absence of a single
Complainant to prove any
one of the numerous charges,
it was found necessary to ascer-
tain the correctness, or otherwise,
of the allegations by the evidence
of the Overseers, Office Subordinates,
Tascars, Maistries and Gardeners
employed on the Rouge, and of
the records in the Rouge Office.
The depositions given by the
Satur Salay Avesseu Gopala Pillai,
Tascars, Maistries and Gardeners
are in favor of Vyapoory Pillai,
while those of the Local Head
Avesseu Samuel Pillai; Head
Accountant Nallaswamy Pillai,
and 3d Accountant Lalah Mukh,
as was to be expected, agree
with most of the allegations
in the petitions - The statements
made by these three Subordinates,
as will be seen from their de-
positions, are merely from hearsay,
and not from their own personal
knowledge, and they are unable
to prove them by documents in
the Office, or by witnesses -

The result of the inquiry
into the several charges, with
the exception of the three which
are now before the Head Assistant
and Deputy Magistrates, is
as follows -

This case is now before the Head Assistant Magistrate, the Local Fund Overseer Samuel Pillai being the Chief Witness. The Latter Talug Overseer Gopala Pillai knows nothing about it (Deposition No 10), and Head Accountant Nallaswen Pillai and 3rd Accountant Lalah Meah (Depositions Nos 11 & 12) state that certain Contractors told them that they had given Vyapoory Pillai a Commission of 10 per Cent on all payments made to them, and that they (Nallaswen Pillai & Lalah Meah) are unable to prove it.

Charge No. vide accompanying List

This Charge refers to the buttresses built to the Setur Bridge in 1869-70, and which are alleged to have been constructed departmentally, and not by Contract as shewn in the Accounts, and of inferior materials & workmanship. There is no proof that the work was executed departmentally. The only Complainant who has come forward, Siva Subramania Pillai of

Charge No 2

Satur states (Deposition No 18) that he does not know whether the work was executed departmentally, or by Contract, but was told by the Head Accountant Nallaswen Pillai, 3rd Accountant Lalah Meah, and Talug Overseer late writer Vencadachellum Iyengar that it had been done departmentally, and that the fact would be proved by the Records in the Office. The Local Fund Overseer Samuel Pillai asserts (Dep No 9) that the work was not done by Contract, because the alleged Contractor Karappanen was a poor ignorant Shepherd lad, and the Talug Overseer did not superintend or furnish the Bills for the work. The Talug Overseer Gopala Pillai does not appear to have had anything to do with the work, besides superintending it for a Couple of days while it was under progress, having had other emergent works to attend to in the Talug; but he states (Dep. No 10) that the Range Officer, and

Karappanen told him at the time that the work was being done on Contract: The Head Accountant Nallaswami Pillai, and 3rd Accountant Lalah Mead state (Dep hrs 11 & 12) that the work was executed departmentally, because the alleged Contractor had never been a Contractor before, and had not the means, or ability, to carry out any work, and because the work was superintended by Vyapoory Pillai himself and several Masties, and payments were made and Accounts kept by two of the latter, one of whom was Vyapoory Pillai's brother-in-law. These arguments are easily refuted, as they have been by Vyapoory Pillai in his Statement No 36 — The work could not be executed departmentally, because no funds had been provided for it until after its completion — It was commenced in November 1869, & completed in January 1870, but it was paid for in the following months, when funds were allotted by the Collector. No Contractor would take up the work, owing to the difficulty not only of procuring materials during the monsoons, but also of executing the work while freshes were frequently coming down the River. Vyapoory Pillai, therefore, prevailed on Karappanen, who had never been a Contractor before, to carry out the work, & helped him in every possible way. He got a Contraction of Road No 15, Karappanen Shairvekaren, to supply the Contractor with necessary funds & labor. He employed two Masties to superintend the work, & went to Courtallam himself to procure Cheruman, as they could not be procured by others, and the work would have been delayed for want of the material — He fixed the wages to be paid to the workmen, and in order to encourage them to come readily and willingly to the work, he made the Contractor pay them in front of the Range Office daily, in doing which the Contractor was probably

assisted by some of the Maistries as he could not read & write, and would have been imposed upon otherwise. Karappana was never employed as a Kangany previous to his Constructing the buttresses, as alleged by the Local Fund Overseer, the Head Accountant & 3rd Accountant. The Head Accountant was asked to produce Acquittance Rolls to shew that he had been so employed, but they were not forthcoming from the Records of the Range Office; nor could he, or anybody else, prove by document, or witnesses, that Karappanen had been employed as a Head Coolie on the work, as stated in the petitions, and in the depositions of the Office Subordinates.

Vyapoory Pillai admits (Statement No 36) that he used the old stones obtained from certain Road Drains on the High Road No 2 for the construction of the buttresses, in lieu of "New rough stone" as provided for in the Estimate, as the latter could not be easily obtained in the neighbourhood at that time; & says that as he had the permission of the Superintending Engineer to dispose of the old stone belonging to the Drains, he gave the required quantity for the buttress work, and obtained from the Contractor in exchange 80 Cub. Yards of new broken stone 1" cube, for the repair of the road, as he had similarly done on two previous occasions. This transaction is not recorded in the Accounts of the Road, or Bridge work, as it ought to have been, nor have any Receipts been given, or received by Vyapoory Pillai, on the Contractor for the same. Vyapoory Pillai says that he did not consider it necessary to record the transaction in the Accounts, because it was simply an exchange of rough stone for broken stone, but I think it was his duty to have done so. The Superintending Engineer's permission for the disposal of the old stone, also, is not on record, it

having been asked for and given verbally, as it alleged, while that Officer was passing along the road.

The Buttresses have been examined by me & the Executive Engineer together, and have been found not so badly constructed as has been represented. The Chunam contains a larger proportion of sand than necessary, and the interstices between the large stones have not been properly filled in with jelly & Chunam, but the work has not been built of "Debris in Mud," as stated in the petitions, and as deposed to by the Local Fund Overseer. The foundations of the buttresses have been built of "Stone & Debris-in clay," as provided for in the Estimate, and it is very probable that the allegations made in the petitions, and repeated by the Local Fund Overseer about seamped work, apply to this part of the building, as the original Estimate had provided for "Stone in Chunam" throughout, and it was not generally known that the revised Estimate, prepared under the orders of the Superintending Engineer, allowed for constructing the buttresses in the manner abovementioned. There was but one Estimate sanctioned for the work, the revised Estimate of Rs 600 and Considering the difficulties under which the buttresses were constructed, and that about 25 Cart loads of Stone & 10 Cart loads of Chunam, which had been collected at the work spot were washed away by the freshes (Dep. No 13), I do not think the Contractor could have derived any Considerable profit from the work. The funds for the work having been provided by the Collector from the One lac Grant for Emergent works, the vouchers connected with it were sent direct to the Collector, & when the Superintending Engineer called for the Accounts in July 1871, the Copy of the vouchers which had been retained in the Office was obtained from the Head Accountant Nallasiven Pillai & forwarded to the Superintending Engineer. Both the Head Accountant and 3rd Accountant, however, declare that no Copy of the vouchers

was kept in the Office; and that the Accounts forwarded to the Superintending Engineer were copied by Vyapoory Pillai from the Original Vouchers in the Collector's Office. But it is not likely that Vyapoory Pillai or the Office Subordinates themselves would have omitted to retain a Copy of the Vouchers of this work in particular, while copies of the Vouchers of all other Emergent works are said to be recorded in the Office. No Station Book was kept up for this work, as it is not required for all works done on Contract. The 3rd Accountant also further states (Ques No 12) that Mistrees had been employed to break up the large masses of old Masonry of the bridge; that he did not see them work, but was told so by the Mistrees themselves. Vyapoory Pillai denies this, and so do all the Maistries & Mistrees of whom I have made inquiries. This was a very Emergent work, as the safety of the Receiving Arches of the Bridge, which had been considerably damaged by the heavy freshes of November 1869, depended on the construction of the Buttresses, which the Superintending Engineer directed should be completed with as little delay as possible, but without appropriating any funds for the purpose. The work was at once commenced & completed according to the wishes of the Superintending Engineer, under great difficulties and by the great exertions of Vyapoory Pillai. The trouble he took to collect materials and labour, and the arrangements he made for the speedy completion of the work, were misconstrued and attributed to self interested motives, by his Office Subordinates with whom he was not on the best of terms; but I do not think that Vyapoory Pillai has misappropriated any portion of the amount sanctioned for the work, or done anything in connection with it for which he now requires to be censured.

Charge No 3

This charge refers to two windows which were removed from the Satur Salay Masonry a few years ago, and which, it is alleged in the charge, were

sold by Auction & the proceeds appropriated to himself by Vyapoory Pillai.

This is a false charge; as the windows were never sold by Auction. One window was refixed in the Taluq Kacheri, soon after its removal, at the request of the Tassildar. The iron bars of the other were used for the window of the new Range Office, and the frame & shutter as a door to the Satur Nursery, which latter, however, were washed away by the floods of November 1869. The Local Fund Overseer knows nothing about it (Resp. hog) - Both the Head Accountant (Resp. No 11), and the 3rd Accountant (Resp. No 12) admit that one of the windows was converted into a door for the Nursery, but the latter declares that he saw both windows taken away subsequently by Vyapoory Pillai to Palamcottah - This latter assertion cannot be true, since one of the windows is now found fixed in the Taluq Kacheri - Vide Copy of Taluq Tassildar's Report herewith Annx. No 37.

Charge No 4

Vyapoory Pillai is here charged with having spent most of his time at Palamcottah in superintending the construction of his house in Vannarpettah; & with having submitted false Inspection Reports, & thereby drawn Travelling Allowance which he was not entitled to. He is alleged to have halted at Palamcottah from 1st to 10th April 1871, & from 5th to 7th, & from 15th to 24th May 1871 without inspecting works in the Neighbourhood. He halted at Satoor from 12th April to 3rd May, and again from 26th to 31st of the latter month, inspecting no works at all, while his Inspection Reports shew that he had been marching and examining works. He has shewn in his Inspection Report for May 1871, that he halted at Coilpetty and Ilyttayr on the 2nd & 3rd respectively, whereas his Estimate of Funds for June, the Indent for Stationery, the Cash Balance Statement, & the Estimate for removing Rock in the Tuticorin Harbour, shew that he was at Satur on those two days - On the 3rd he was with the Collector the whole day at Satur. In June 1871

he was out on Circuit only for 8 days, and halted the remaining 22 days at Salem. Similarly he halted there from 8th to 25th July 1871. There is also a sweeping statement in Ramasamy's petition (No 2) that Vyapoory Pillai was at Palamcottah from July 1870 to March 1871 - 9 months - superintending the Construction of his house in Vannarpettah.

The Local Fund Overseer, Head Accountant & 3rd Accountant are unable to prove these charges; & merely state (Dep Nos 9, 11 & 12) that a Comparison between the above mentioned documents in the Office, & Vyapoory Pillai's Inspection Reports will show that the latter are false. A comparison has accordingly been made, and a few inconsistencies have been discovered, not only as regards the places Vyapoory Pillai halted at, but also the distances he travelled each day, as shown in his Inspection Reports and in the Letter Books &c in the Office respectively -

In reference to the Entries in his Inspection Report for May 1871, Vyapoory Pillai however states (No 36) that on the 1st he was at Salem carrying out work that had been ordered by the Collector that morning; On the 2nd he was at the same place in the forenoon, and in the afternoon marched to Coilpatty; but recollecting that he had not obtained funds from the Collector for the work he was doing, he returned to Salem the same night. On the 3rd he remained at Salem all day with the Collector, till about 4 P.M, when he started and marched direct to Ryotam to make up for lost time. On the 4th he went to Gangundam and remained there the whole day. From the 5th to 21st, the statement in his Inspection Report, he says, is correct. On the 22nd which is entered as at Ryotam, he went to Swillaperi in the morning, passed the heat of the day there, and wrote the letter to the Superintending Engineer dated from that place, returning to Ryotam

in the evening. He declares that all his Inspection Reports are correct, with the Exception that some of the dates may require a similar Explanation to the above. He denies the charge of his having frequently gone to Palamcottah without leave, and states that he has never been there except on duty, that is, to visit the Superintending Engineer, or the Collector.

Although it is clear from this Charge, that the Subordinate in possession of the Office Records are the Authors of the several Petitions; & although Vyapury Pillai has explained the apparent inconsistencies between his Inspection Report for May 1871 and his Letter of 8th Jan., still, I am of opinion, that Vyapury Pillai's Explanation is not very Satisfactory, and that his Inspection Reports cannot be fully relied upon.

Charge No 5. This Charge is that Vyapury Pillai submitted Estimates to the Extent of Rs 5000 for closing breaches on Roads Nos 14 & 18 occasioned by the floods of November 1869, but appropriated this amount to himself, and executed the Emergent Repairs from the maintenance grants for those Roads. This is an entirely false charge, for no Estimate had been submitted, or sanctioned, for Repairing damages on Road No 18 between Coilpatty & Ettiapuram; and the sum actually expended on Road No 14 between Ettiapuram & Tuticorin, in the latter end of 1869-70 was but Rs 1800, out of the Sanctioned Estimate of Rs 4400. This Expenditure was incurred on Measurements of the work taken by the Maistries, & checked, in a few instances, by the Sub Conductor Mr. Barnett, and the remainder by Vyapury Pillai himself. The Local Fund Overseer Samuel Pillai, who had charge of the Road states (Dep No 9) that Road No 18 was not breached by the floods of November 1869; that no Estimate

was submitted for it. & that the slight damages sustained by the road were repaired from the maintenance grant, the payments having been made by the Range Officer on the Bills furnished by himself. The Head Accountant & 3rd Accountant know nothing regarding the Expenditure incurred on the abovementioned two roads, and can prove nothing (Encl nos 11 & 12)—

In addition to the Expenditure incurred on Road No 14, the following sums were spent on other Roads on Sanctioned Estimates, viz

High Road No 2 — Rs 1200.
Road between Velatthulam and Kolatthur — " 1900.
pc Otapedaram and Scollapeti — " 140.
pc Otapedaram & Vyapeer " 700.

These disbursements too were made by Vyapury Pillai on measurements taken, in every instance, by the Road Maistries & Checkid, for the greater part, by the Covenant, as appears from the vouchers recorded in the Office. Both the Exception of the Expenditure on Roads Nos 2 & 14,

the funds for which were allotted by the Collector from the one dac grant, that on all other roads was incurred from local funds, and entered in the Surveyors Report. On no occasion in 1869-70, where the abovementioned Estimates were sanctioned, was any money spent on Sanctioned repairs and charged to maintenance grant, with the Exception of a breach on Road No 2 near Velatthur, which completely stopped the traffic, & which was repaired at a cost of Rs 100, & charged to the maintenance grant, pending the sanction of the Emergent Estimate. This circumstance was reported to the then Superintending Engineer according to Vyapury Pillai's Statement, and the money thus spent was not recovered, as the balance of the Emergent Estimate was never allotted. The work was completed from the maintenance grant in the following year.

Charges No 687.

These charges are, that Vyapury Pillai employed his Brother-in-Law Subbu Pillai, as a Maistry on Road Works, who spent most of his time at Cutur; & that considerable

sums from the maintenance
Grants for that Road, save
Roads Nos 2. 11. & 18 have been
appropriated to himself by
Vyapoory Pillai; he stated, col-
lected in one year, having
been retained & charged for
a second time in the following
year.—

The Local Funds Overseer, the
latter Talug Overseer, the Head
Accountant, 3rd Accountant &
two Subaccounts Pillai, all
assert that Vyapoory Pillai's
brother-in-law was employed
as a Mairsty, who neglected
his duties & spent most of
his time at Jaffna. Vyapoory
Pillai admits that Subbie
Pillai is his brother-in-law
and states (No 36) that Subbie
Pillai was employed for 3 or
4 years on Roads Nos 2 & 15,
and that on one occasion,
after he had been dismissed
for a few months, he was
again reappointed at the
special request of the Gover-
Gopala Pillai, who had dif-
ficulties in obtaining labour
for the works, but he denied
his having special knowledge of
his time at Jaffna - his pay
as he knows, he was regularly

on the work every day.

The latter portion of the charge
in reference to the expenditure
of the maintenance grants is
false. Both the Local Fund
Overseer & Talug Overseer (Nos 9 & 10) assert that the main-
tenance grants for the Roads
in question, have been fully
& fairly spent respectively every
year. The Head Accountant
and 3rd Accountant know nothing
about it (vide Nos 11 & 13).

In all instances payments
have been made on measured
measurements, checked by the
Overseers, except when the
Overseers were absent on ac-
count of sickness, when the
measurements were checked
by Vyapoory Pillai himself;
and the materials of one year
have not been brought forward,
and paid for a second time
in the following year: Vide
Mainsmei depositions Nos 23 & 26
& 28. There is nothing to
shew that the entries in the
Proper Report against the
Roads are not all bona fide
charges.—

Charge No 8

This refers to the Sub Magistrates Kachcheri at Velatti-Kulam, and the two new roads at that place, & at Vyapoory, all of which are alleged to have been constructed of inferior materials at very high rates, & that a moiety of the Expenditure thereon has been charge between Vyapoory Pillai & the Contractor.

The Head Accountant and 3d Accountant know nothing about these three works, (Dep Nos 11 & 12), but the Local Fund Overseer who has had charge of the two roads, and has often seen the Sub Magistrate Kachcheri, states (Dep 10) that this Building is constructed of inferior materials & workmanship, and that the walls are cracked from top to bottom in many places, but that he does not know whether the rates allowed are unnecessarily high, or not: that the two roads are made of good materials at reasonable rates; & that Vyapoory Pillai has received a Commission of 10 per cent on the above mentioned works from the Contractor, who has admitted the same before the Head Assistant Magistrate. This is the only evidence against the work at Vyapoory Pillai.

The above mentioned three works cannot be conveniently inspected at present, the road from Pallai cart track over black cotton soil to Velatti-Kulam having rendered impassable for bandies by the recent heavy rains, but as all three works are still in an incomplete condition they will be examined & reported on by the Executive Engineer in charge of the Pause as early as practicable.

I may here add that Velatti-Kulam is a small village situated in a very unfavorable locality for carrying out a large work like that now under construction at that place. All kinds of materials and labor for the work have to be procured as they have been procured by the Contractor, from distances varying from 5 to 40 miles, & considering the rates at which similar buildings are now being

constructed in other parts of the District, I do not consider the rates allowed in the Estimate for the Buildings unnecessarily high.

Charge No 9.

This Charge is similar to Charge No 7, as above, viz. that little or nothing has been done for the upkeep of the Vyapoory Road, Kotchiyar Road & Road No 18, whereas the maintenance grants for the same, amounting to the aggregate to Rs 5400 for the past 3 years have been Charged in the Accounts. Vappuvpoolier to himself by Vyapoory Pillai. Nobody has come forward to prove the Charge. The Overseer and Office Subordinates have nothing about it (Reports Nos 9 & 12). The grants have been fully and fairly expended during years as shewn in the Accounts in the manner stated above. The Charge is a false one.

Charge No 10.

This Charge is that Vyapoory Pillai has had no Tent during the last 5 years, & that he has habitually employed the Government Lascars as his private Servants (Cook & Boatyman). The statements made by the two Overseers (Reports Nos 9 & 10) & the two Office Subordinates (Rep 11 & 12) agree, for the most part, with this allegation, whole three of the three Lascars (Nos 30 & 32) refute the Charge. Vyapoory Pillai (No 36) states that in July or August 1865, he purchased a Tent & had it in use till April 1871, when, that Tent having become old & useless, he purchased another which he has been with from that time. Lieut Lively & Capt Pleadwell, the only Superintending Engineers he has worked under, saw the former Tent & considered it suitable, that he always had a Cart & pair of bullocks, which he has regularly taken about with him, and that he never employed the Government Lascars as his Cook & Boatymen.

It is probable that Vyapoory Pillai always had a Tent, as he states, but found it necessary to use it except on a few occasions. It is also probable that the Lascars have worked

Vyapoory Pillai's meals and drove his buggy in cases of emergency for a day or two, when his own Cook or Headyman happened to fall sick, and I do not see the harm of their having done so, especially as they appear to have worked of their own free will.

Charge No II.

This charge is that Vyapoory Pillai has since the last 5 years, employed a Nursery Gardener & a Gilderman as his private Servants (Cook & Horsekeeper). There is no proof that any of the Nursery Gardeners, or a Gilderman was employed by Vyapoory Pillai as his Cook and Horsekeeper. The Coolies and Office Subordinates employed (with the following exceptions) were employed on Public Roads (Dep Nos 9 to 12) but the Gardeners & Road Maistries deny the Charge altogether (Dep Nos 16.17.21.25.26 & 29).

Vyapoory Pillai has always had a Cook & Horsekeeper of his own.

This Charge is that Tools for use on Public Roads (how worth less than Rs 100)

Charge No 12

were purchased of a Blacksmith of Madura for Rs 500, who was made to supply all the iron works for Vyapoory Pillai's new house, in Vannarpettai.

A Blacksmith in Satur has since the last 3 or 4 years supplied Tools for use in the Range, but it is now impossible to ascertain their value, many of them being considerably worn and unserviceable, but judging from what new ones are left in Stock, they appear to have been supplied of the same description & at the same rates Common in the District. The Local Fund Overseer, the Head Accountant & 3rd Accountant alleged (Dep Nos 9.11 & 12) that the same Blacksmith supplied the iron works for Vyapoory Pillai's new house, but that they do not know whether he was paid for them, or not. Vyapoory Pillai admits this & says that he saw no harm in obtaining such iron works as he required for his house from the same Blacksmith on payment, and which payments he can prove. The Taluq Overseer Gopala Pillai witnessed one payment of Rs 22 (Dep No 10).

Charge No 13

Here Vyapoory Pillai is charged with having destroyed & falsified his Cash Book to screen his fraudulent transactions. This case is at present before the Head Asst Magistrate, but from the enquiries I have made, it does not appear that the Cash Book was altered and rebound with a bad motive. The Head Accountant volunteers to state (Dep. No 11) that certain words which had not been executed, or had been but partly executed entered in March 1871, were charged for in the Accounts of that month, but is unable to prove the allegation.

Charge No 14

This charge is that Vyapoory Pillai drew pay for 20 Hairdressers two years ago, and appropriated to himself Rs 120 of the money then drawn. The Local Fund Overseer (Dep 7) and the Salt Sales Overseer (Dep No 10) know nothing about this, but the Head Accountant and 3rd Accountant both affirm (Dep Nos 11 & 12) that about 4 years ago, the allotment for the Petty Establishment had been fully expended at the close of the year, and with a view to spread the whole balance Vyapoory Pillai caused the Salaries of all the Hairdressers for two months, and obtained their signatures in the Acquittance Rolls, but paid them their actual Salaries, and kept back the difference, promising to supply them with clothes to make them look respectable; that with a portion of the money kept back he purchased a few clothes of the value of about Rs 20 which he kept in the Office for some time, and then took them away, & never gave them to the Hairdressers. The Acquittance Rolls for the months of December 1867 & January 1868 in the Office, show that of the 19 Hairdressers, who were then employed in the Range, the Salaries of 13 Hairdressers, varying from 9 to 15 Rs, were raised by two Rupees (for December, & in January some of those who had been increased were reduced, and others raised, confirming Vyapoory Pillai's Statement) thereby raising the average monthly Expenditure

incidence the head Petty Establishment by about Rs 50 for those two months. The Salaries of the work Establishment have been charged to the works since February 1868.

Vyapoory Pillai admits (No 36) that he increased the Salaries of some of the Maistries for December 1867 & January 1868 and says that he did so according to his usual Custom, as he increased or decreased their Salaries according to the manner in which they worked: that the amounts entered in the Despatchance Rolls were actually paid to the men, and no portion of them was kept back by himself - that he did purchase, at his own cost, cloths to the value of upwards of 100 Rs to present to the Maistries as an encouragement, and kept some of them in the Office for some time, but that he afterwards changed his mind about it, & sold most of the cloths, retaining one or two for his own use - This may, or may not, be

the facts of the case, but as not a single Maistry has come forward to complain that any portion of his Salary was, at any time, kept back by Vyapoory Pillai, and as the 3 Maistries who have been asked about it acknowledge (Dep Nos 23, to 25) that the amounts entered in the Despatchance Rolls for Dec 67 & January 1868, & which they signed, have been received by them in full, the allegation therefore must be considered as not proved -

Charge No 15. This charge is that Vyapoory Pillai in the end of March 1871 fraudulently charged Rs 6000 in the Accounts for works alleged to have been executed in the Otapedarum Tank, while no work had been executed. This charge cannot be true, because, as the Head Accountant (Dep No 11) and Vyapoory Pillai (No 36) state that the total Expenditure in the Range in March last was Rs 6133, of which only Rs 4748 were

spent in the Ola pedanum Taluq on all works of Irrigation & Communication - The Local Fund Overseer & Salem Taluq Overseer know nothing about it (Dep Nos 9 & 10) - The 3rd Accountant also knows nothing about it, tho he states (Dep No 12) that the Repairs to the Ola: pedanum Periya Kulam and the River Embankment at Salem were not executed to the extent charged for in the Accounts for March 1871 and that the works were Completed Subsequently, but it is useless to prove it by the documents in this Office - Three Contractors named Ponnen Asaree Madasamy Pillai & Chappane Pillai, who carried out a large amount of Road, Communication & Irrigation Works in the Ola pedanum Taluq in the last Official Year, and who have been examined declare (Dep Nos 33 & 35) that all the payments received by them in March last, and in the previous months, on the Bills signed by them, were for work actually executed, which were measured by the Ministries and Checked by the Overseers & the Range Officer - The Vouchers in the Office prove their Statements to be true, and were acknowledged by them -

Charge No 16. Vyapoory Pillai is here charged with having taken the Government Lascars with him to Travancore on account of his Son's marriage, & kept them there for 20 days without authority - Vyapoory Pillai does not deny this Charge and states (No 36) that he took the Lascars with him with the permission of the Superintending Engineer - As Vyapoory Pillai was absent at Travancore only on 10 days leave, the Lascars who accompanied him could not have been kept there for 20 days as stated in the petitions -

Charge No 17. This charge is, that Rs 75, the sale proceeds of 300 bunches of plantains produced in the Nursery Garden at Nemmancy, instead of being credited in the Accounts, were appropriated

to himself by Vyapoory Pillai. The Local Fund Overseer, the Head Accountant & 3rd Account-ant support this allegation (Dep Nos 9, 11 & 12) but state that they do not know the exact quantity of the plantains or the amount of the Sale pro-ceeds; while the Taluq Overseer Gopala Pillai (No 10) the Gardeners (Dep Nos 16 & 17) and a Road Maistry (Dep No 24) Contradict the statement. I have inspected the Nemmoney Nursery, which contains at present about 50 stunted, unhealthy looking plantain trees, with not a single fruit on them, and am inclined to believe that the charge is greatly exaggerated. It is probable that as stated by Gardener Mauri (Dep No 17) about 5 bunches of good plan-tains, & about 50 bunches not fit for food were obtained from the plantation, & that the former were sold for a trifle and the money spent by the Overseer on the purchase of ropes & baling baskets for the use of the Nursery as stated by Vyepoory Pillai (No 36) & Overseer Gopala Pillai (No 10)—

I have seen the Account of Receipt & Disbursement in the possession of the Taluq Overseer.

Charge No. 18— Vyapoory Pillai is charged with having fraudu-lently employed Maistries for Local Fund Works at a Cost of Rs 37 per Measem, in-stead of appointing a perma-nent Mistry on Rs 20 as sanctioned by the Superintend-ing Engineer. There are no permanent Local Fund Maistries in this Range, the Salary of the temporary Maistries employed on the roads being paid out of the Sanctioned Estimates for the same. Vyapoory Pillai states (No 36) that the two Maistries allowed to each Range in G.O. No 1931 of 18th June 1868 were not appointed by the Superintending Engineer when the Overseer was appointed, and that he remembers receiv-ing instructions from the Superintending Engineer not to employ them—

This charge is that Vyapury Pillai submitted a verbal Emergent Estimates for repairing the Nurseries along Roads No 2, & appropriated the sanctioned amount to himself without effecting the repairs. The Talug Overseer (Dep: No 10) the Local Fund Overseer (Dep: No 13) the Head Accountant (No 11) the 3rd Accountant (No 12) a Nursery gardener (No 15) & two Road Maistries (Nos 23 & 28) all do not know anything about this. But Vyapury Pillai states (No 36) that in November 1869 an Estimate of about Rs 100, for repairing 3 Nurseries on Road No 2, was sanctioned by the Collector, who also provided the funds; that the repairs were carried out by Maistry Gnanadesigan Pillai and that the Accounts of Expenditure were seal, thro' the Tarsildar, to the Collector.

Charge No 9.

This charge is, that Vyapury Pillai has purchased lands at Gaingundan for Rs 6000, but has excluded the same from the Return forwarded by him to the Superintending Engineer.

Charge No 20.

The Local Fund Overseer (Dep: No 13) the Head Accountant (No 11) and 3rd Accountant (No 12) state from hearsay that Vyapury Pillai possesses lands at Gaingundan, which are registered in the name of Pethuveyen Iyen, a Brahmin of that Village. The Talug Overseer (Dep: No 10) states that Vyapury Pillai had lands in the aboumentioned Village until 4 or 5 months ago, when he sold them off, and received in exchange the money he had laid out on them. The gardener of the Nursery (No 15) and the Road Maistry (No 28) at Gaingundan, do not know whether Vyapury Pillai has, or has not, lands in that Village.

Vyapury Pillai denies (No 36) having any other land in his possession, except that shewn in the Register sent to the Superintending Engineer.

This Charge is that Contractor Charge No. 21.
Supparaiy Pillai who Constructed the Sub Jail at Velatikulam, & obtained a large profit from the work, has built at his own Cost, a large house for Vyapoory Pillai in Nunnaipettah worth Rs 5000.

The Taluq Peishcar knows nothing about it (No 10). The Local Fund Overseer (No 9) and the Head Accountant (No 11) state that they heard that the Contractor had supplied a quantity of wood & Cheenam towards the Construction of the House, and the 3rd Accountant (No 12) that he saw the Contractor's brother in law, and others, working at the house, but he does not know whether it was built at the Cost of the Contractor or Vyapoory Pillai. Both Vyapoory Pillai and the Contractor deny the Charge. The former states (Dep No 36) that no person has in any way contributed to the Cost of the building either in funds, or materials—

The latter declares (No 35) that he has not supplied funds, or materials for the Building, but that his Son-in-law superintended its construction for about 6 months, as a Maistry, and received a monthly Salary of Rs 15 from Vyapoory Pillai. The accusation is a false one.

Charge No 22. This Charge is, that Vyapoory Pillai has employed two men who were paid as Hangmen on Road No 15, to do his private work for the last two years.

The two Overseers (Deps Nos 9 & 10), the two Office Subordinates (Deps Nos 11 & 12) and Swia Subramania Pillai (Dep No 8) all state that one man named Nunnah, not two men, was employed for a long while as alleged above. Vyapoory Pillai denies (No 36) having employed any Government Servant at any time, as his private Servant; but it is probable that the man Nunnah has been occasionally employed by Vyapoory Pillai as his Peishkar, or as an additional Peon to watch the Range Office and Stores during his absence from Tatur—

Sire Vyapoory Pillai is charged with having ordered the Maistries to supply him with Straw, Vegetables &c., and with having fined them when they failed to do so. The Coolies (Dep. Nos 9 & 10) and two Office Subordinates (Dep. Nos 11 & 12) know nothing about this, and 6 Maistries who have been examined (Dep. Nos 23 to 26 & 28 & 29) deny having, at any time, supplied, or been ordered to supply, Vyapoory Pillai with Straw and Vegetables.
This is a false Charge.

Charge No. 23.

This Charge is, that Local Fund-Coolies Samuel Pillai spent many days at Palamcottah in May last, without leave, & left for Satur only on the 4th June.
The Satur Tahsildar (Dep. No. 10) and the two Office Subordinates (Dep. Nos 11 & 12) state that Samuel Pillai often went to Palamcottah, but whether with, or without leave, they do not know. Samuel Pillai himself states (Dep. No. 9) that having had charge of the Road from Etapedaram to Sivillapery he often went into Palamcottah after inspecting the Road; that he also went there in September 1870 to attend Vyapoory Pillai's Son's wedding, and on that occasion, stayed there only 3 days with Vyapoory Pillai's permission. Vyapoory Pillai is not aware (No. 36) of the Local Fund Coolies having been to Palamcottah in May 1871.

Charge No 24

Charge No. 25.

This Charge is, that the Satur Tahsildar alone receives from 400 to 500 Rs from Vyapoory Pillai for distributing on Works, and not the other Coolies of the Range.
Vyapoory Pillai states (Dep. No. 36) that he does not trust any Coolies with money to make payments, except to Maistries and Chief Coolies, and even these he often pays himself; and that this has been the case is proved by the evidence

of two Revisers (Dep Nos 9 & 10), and two Office subordinates. (Dep Nos 11 & 12) -

The 3rd Accountant Lalah Sriah, it will be observed from his deposition regarding this charge, has apparently had more to do with the anonymous petitions, than the other subordinates who are strongly suspected to have been the Authors of them.

Charge No 26.

This charge is, that the Sattur Taluq Revenue Gopala Pillai has been fined by the Superintending Engineer, for having submitted a false Inspection Report.

The Revenue admits this and says (Dep No 10) that his Salary & Travelling Allowance for 9 days in February 1871 were stopped, because he had been to Madura in that month without permission.

Vyapoory Pillai states (No 36) that at the time he submitted the Revenue Inspection Report he was not aware that he had been to Madura; and that on making inquiries, after a reference from the Superintending Engineer about it, he found it was the case.

Charge No 27.

Sree Vyapoory Pillai is charged with having, about 4 or 5 years ago, received a sum of Rs 200 from one Alagiri Naik of Vellia pursuit in Sattur Taluq, under false pretences.

This case is before the Deputy Magistrate, who, I hear, has dismissed it, on what grounds I do not know.

Coilpatty
30th November 1871.

D. McNair
Sub Engineer
D.P.W.

Gillage
Exec: Engr

List of

List of documents.

No 1. Swa Subramania Pillais petition dated 9th Augt 71 with a draft in Tamil.

No 2. Ramasamy's petition dated 20 June 1871 with English translation.

No 3. Veloyadums English petition dated 11 July 1871

No 4. Dc do do 28th do.

No 5 Dc do do 1st Augt 1871

No 6. Arunachellums petition to Collector dated 12 Augt 1871 with English Translation.

No 7. Anonymous petition dated 6 June 1871 with English translation.

No 8 Ayilan drus Pillais petition dated 20 June 1871 with English translation.

No 9. Deposition of Local Fund Boorsee Samuel Pillai

No 10 Dc of Satue Tahsy Boorsee Gopala Pillai

No 11 Dc of Head Accountant Nallasamy Pillai

No 12 Dc of 3rd Accountant Salak Meah.

No 13 Dc of Contractor Marappanen.

No 14 Dc of Marappanen Shaiva Karen

No 15 Dc of Gardener Subba Thevan.

No 16 Dc of do Perumallu Monia Karen

No 17 Dc of do Mauri

No 18 Dc of Siva Subramania Pillai of Satur

No 19 Dc of Sonnaiah Pillai of Satur

No 20 Dc of Arunachellum Pillai of Kollapatti.

No 21 Dc of late Gardener Coomarasami Pillai

No 22 Dc of Veloyadum Pillai of Satur

No 23 Dc of Maistry Sholamalai Pillai

No 24 Dc of Devapran Pillai Maistry

No 25 Dc of Maistry Gnanadesigum Pillai

No 26 Dc of do Manickappa Pillai

No 27 Dc of Munsamy Nunnah Saib

No 81

Report by the Superintending Engineer 8th Division into the charges preferred against Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay.

No 26. Deposition of Chairty Veerasamy Naick
No 29 do of do Muttia Pillai
No 30. do of Lascar Arunachellum Pillai
No 31 do of do Pakkiam
No 32 do of do Viraragoo Pillai
No 33 do of Coolie Pannen Pesane
No 34 do of do Maderasami Pillai
No 35 do of do Chuppani Pillai
No 36 do of Supervisor Vyapoory Pillai
No 37 Receipt Gopala Pillai's Report dated 19th Nov 1871
No 38 Coolies Salary Acquittance Roll for Dec 1867
No 39 do do do do January 1868
No 40 List of Charges against Supervisor Vyapoory Pillai
No 41 Three Tamil papers received from Sattur Tahsildar whereby certain persons could not be found.
No 42 One letter & Enclosures from Deputy Coll[r] in charge of Treasury
No 43 - Three letters Nos 24. 25 & 27 from Supervisor
No 44 - One letter to Supt Dept from Supervisor
No 45 - One Travelling Allowance Bill for Dec
No 46 — One Inspection Report for May 1871.
No 47 - One do — do — June 1871
No 48 - One Estimate & Five Vouchers for Sattur Bridge Buttresses.

Samuel Coldpatty
Nov[r] 30. 1871

C. L. Mayne
Asst Engineer

property, and also built two costly houses at Palamcottah (Collector's note cl.e 52) since he was put in charge of the late 4th Range Unit.

The authors of the 5 petitions herewith sent (Nos 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7) charge the Supervisor with dishonest and fraudulent transactions. The Range subordinates viz Head Accountant Nallasivem Pillay (No 11), the 3rd Accountant Lalah Meah (No 12), and late Satur Taluq Overseer Writer Vencatachellum Iyengar (No 53) and Local Fund Overseer Samuel Pillay (No 9) all state that certain Contractors told them that they had given Vyapoory Pillay 5% commission of 10 per cent on all payments made to them; and a few Contractors have made a similar statement before the Head Assistant Magistrate. Taking into consideration the large sums of money annually spent

N.B. The numbers refer to the List of documents accompanying the Supt. Tinnevelly Letter.

in the late 4th Range, and the present unsatisfactory and disgraceful condition of the Roads and works of irrigation in that Range, I fully believe that the Supervisor has been in league with the Contractors employed by him, and that he has proved himself utterly untrustworthy and unfit on this account to be retained in the Government service. A charge of this kind is always difficult to prove, and that the present charge against the Supervisor cannot be proved to a conviction, is no proof of its not being founded on fact.

Charge No 2. This charge refers to the Buttresses built to the Satur Bridge in 1869-70, and which are alleged to have been constructed Departmentally, and not by Contract as shewn in the Accounts (No 48).

The charges preferred against Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay in the accompanying 16 Petitions are 27 in number, and are particularized in the accompanying List No 40.

Charge No 1. This case was taken up by the Head Assistant Magistrate of Timevelly, the result of whose investigation has not as yet been communicated to me. I am however informed that the inquiry is left in abeyance with a view to obtaining further evidence for the prosecution, and should the charge be proved, the Supervisor will be dealt with according to Law. Whether the Supervisor be convicted and punished, or not, by the Magistrate, I have no doubt in my mind that he is guilty of this charge. It is talked of all over the District that the Supervisor's conduct and proceedings as a Government Servant have been highly improper and dishonest, and that he has amassed

ond of inferior materials and work-
manship. Mr. Sub Engineer McNair
who investigated this charge under
the orders of Mr Sage, Executive Engr.
near Northern Range, reports (at No 51),
that there is no proof that the work
was executed departmentally, and that
it has not been so badly constructed
as has been represented. Mr Sage (at No 50)
agrees with the first part of this state-
ment, but with regard to the latter
part states that the work has been
satisfactorily completed. I regret that
I cannot concur with the opinion ex-
pressed either by Mr McNair or Mr Sage.
The proceedings connected with this
work were very irregular and un-
justifiable, and the Supervisor's statement



is hopelessly improbable and untrustworthy
He declares (at No 36) that the work was
executed on contract by one Karuppen,
but the evidence of this Contractor (at No 13)
is simply ludicrous. The accounts (at No 48)
have been prepared to present the appearance
of the work having been done by a Con-
tractor, but there is sufficient evidence
to prove that Vyapoory Pillay carried
out the work himself with a view of
benefitting himself thereby. The Local
Fund Overseer Samuel Pillay (at No 9), the
Head Accountant Vellaswamy Pillay (at No 11),
the 3d Accountant Lalah Meeah (at No 12), the
late Satur Pillay Overseer's Writer Venkata-
chellum Iyengar (at No 53) and Maistry
Karupena Pillay (at No 79), all affirm, as
stated in the 7 petitions (at Nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and
8) that the work was not executed by

or Contract, and it is very clear that
in such could not actually have been
in the case, because the alleged Contractor
th was a poor shepherd lad who had
n never been a Contractor before, and
tho had not the means, training, or ability
to carry out any work of the kind; and
wa because the work was superintended by
it t Kyapoory Pillay himself and several
as Maistries, and payments were made,
agre and accounts kept by two of the Maistries,
men one of whom was Vyapoory Pillay's own
part brother-in-law. The Supervisor states that
satis the work could not be executed depart-
I can mentally, because no funds had been
press appropriated for it until after its com-
The p pletion; and that as no Contractor
work would take up the work, for the reasons
Justifi stated in the Supervisor's deposition (Nº 36)

he prevailed on Karuppen (the shepherd
lad) to carry out the work, and helped
him in every possible way, and also
got a contractor, Karupperian Shairva
Karen, to supply the lad with necessary
funds and labour. If this statement
be true, viz that the Contractor Karappena
Shairvakaren consented to supply the
shepherd lad with funds, and to render
him all the required assistance, it is
difficult to understand why this Contractor
objected to carry out the work himself
as stated; and consented to the adoption
of the Supervisor's round about Proceed-
ing with the Shepherd lad. This lad
states (Nº 13) that he received a loan
of Rs 300 from Karuppenen Shairvakaren
for the work, as admitted by the latter,
but there is no Receipt, nor any account

ons whatever to prove their statements, and
nio it is neither usual, nor probable, that
who one Contractor would advance money
the in order that another Contractor might
nee receive all the profits. It is stated on
that evidence that cannot be doubted that
wa the alleged Contractor, Karuppen, who
it h had previously been handy-man to
as Vyapoory Pillay's brother-in-law Subba
Pillay, was engaged expressly for, and
agre employed on, the buttress work as a
me Kangany, or Head Cooly, and if the
part Bridge Accounts had been produced,
Satis as they should have been, his name
I co would, in all probability, have been
pres found entered in them as a Head Cooly.
The It is evident from Karuppen's own state-
wor ment, that he was not the Contractor
Just for the Buttress work. He states that



he signed two Bills, one for each buttress,
and received Rupees 500 and odd from
Vyapoory Pillay, whereas there is only one
Bill, in duplicate, for the work; that he
paid the Bricklayers and Coolies the
wages fixed by Vyapoory Pillay, that he
kept no account of the expenditure, nor
did he ask anybody to keep an account;
that he was never on the work during
the day, and that it was carried out
by Vyapoory Pillay, certain Maistries and
Karuppen Chairmakaren; that he does
not know whether Vyapoory Pillay's brother
in-law, Subba Pillay, was employed
on the work, because he (The putative
Contractor!) was never on the works
in the day-time, that he did not
pay the Maistries and does not know
whether they received any salary from

Vyapoory Pillay. It is also clear from the statement of Karuppanen Shairva Karen (Ct 14) that Karuppanen was never a contractor, either then or before, and that he could therefore not have lent him any money for the work as he alleges to have done. The 3rd Accountant Lalah Meiah (Ct 12) and late Salary Overseer writer Venkatachellum Iyengar (Ct 53) affirm that Milemen, who were paid from the maintenance grants for roads, were employed on the buttress work, and I see no reason to doubt their statements. Vyapoory Pillay admits (Ct 36) that he used the old stones obtained from certain old Road pavements for the construction of the Buttress in lieu of "New Rough Stone" as provided for in the Estimate, and that as he had the Superintending Engineer's permission to dispose of the old stones belonging to these pavements, he gave the required quantity of old stone for the buttress work, and obtained from the Contractor in exchange 80 cube yards of new broken stone for the repair of the road. This statement cannot be true. There is nothing on record to shew that any permission had been given for the disposal of the old pavement stones. Again the exchange of these stones for new broken stone is not recorded in the Accounts of the Road or Bridge work, as it ought to have been. Moreover the late Salary Overseer writer Venkatachellum Iyengar declares (Dep Ct 53) that in July last he was asked by the Supervisor to enter in the Station Book of the Sivagasi Road for 1869-70, the measurements of the 80 Cubic yards of broken stone said to have been received

in exchange for the old Pavement stones used in the buttresses, but that he declined to do this, because he was well aware that not one single Cubic Yard of stone had been so received. This latter statement is corroborated by the 3d Accountant Lalah Ellah and the Satur Salary Overseer Gopalen Pillay. The fact of this Overseer, who carried out all the emergent works in the Saluy in that year, having had no connection whatever with, and not having furnished the usual measurements and Bill for this work, is alone sufficient to prove that Vyapoory Pillay carried out the work himself, and from his own private funds. The Overseers statement, though very cautiously worded, also corroborates the above conclusion. Vyapoory Pillay states (Nº 36) that he gave the Plan and estimate for the work to this Overseer with necessary instructions to carry it out, and that he (the Overseer) superintended the work. The Overseer denies this not only in his Deposition Nº 19, but also in his letter to Mr Sage dated 20th November 1871 (Nº 60), and adds that "Vyapoory Pillay asked him, through his writer, to prepare a station book for the work; but that he (the Overseer) declined to do this, because he was not in no way connected with the work." This is a very suspicious circumstance why should the Superviser ask the Overseer to prepare the station Book? The Subordinate disobeys his Superiors Orders, and the latter makes no report

of it. There is no station book forthcoming for this work.

The Buttresses, moreover, have been very badly constructed. I have examined both buttresses, and I consider that the charge against the Supervisor that the work has been entirely built of the Bridge Debris in sound is so far correct inasmuch as the debris has to a considerable extent been employed without chunam in the interior of the buttresses. Only one buttress was examined by Messrs Sage and McNair, and that only on the surface. The Vouchers connected with the work were sent by the Supervisor direct to the Controller, and no copy of them was retained in the Range Office, as were those of the Vouchers for all other Emergent works executed in 1869-70, according to the statement of the Head Accountant and 3rd Accountant. When the accounts of the work were called for in July last, the Supervisor, it is said, obtained copies of the original Vouchers in the Collector's Office, or prepared fresh Vouchers from the Estimate, and sent them to me. However that may be, the Bills are a mere transcript of the Estimate (No 48), the amount sanctioned for the Buttresses was Rs 600, and the work might have been done in the course of a fortnight, instead of continuing, as it did, for 3 months, and I cannot bring myself to believe, considering that the work has been built entirely of the Bridge Debris, with a small quantity of old stone, and with very little chunam, that the money stated

to have been spent upon it was actual-
ly expended. It is clear to me that a
profit of at least Rs 200, or Rs 250 must
have been made on it, and that this
profit was pocketed by Vyapoory Pillay.—
Charge № 3. The two windows re-
ferred to in this charge were not sold
by auction, and the proceeds appropri-
ated to himself by Supervisor Vyapoory
Pillay, as stated in Sinnachellum's
petition № 6.— But there is no doubt
that the windows which are Govern-
ment property, have been misappro-
priated by the Supervisor. The Super-
visor states in his Deposition № 36,
that of the two windows removed from
the Satur Taluq Cutcheri, a few
years ago, one is now lying at the
said Building completed, and the iron
bars of the other were used for the
windows of the new Range Office; and
the frame and shutter as a door to the
Satur Nursery; and that the latter were
washed away by the floods of November
1869. This statement is entirely false, ex-
cept that half the frame of one window
was made into a door for the nursery,
but eventually this door together with
the other half window, and the second
window, were taken away by the Super-
visor for his new house at Palamcottah.
Both the 3d Accountant Lalah Micah
(№ 12) and Satur Taluq Overseer Writer
Vencatachellum Iyengar (№ 53) saw
these windows taken away to Palam-
cottah, together with other new windows
made at Satur for the Supervisor's house
there. The Satur Taluq Overseer who

was directed by Mr Sage (N°56) to for-
ward the window which Vyapoory Pillay
had deposed was lying at the Taluq kutcheri,
states in reply (N°57) that no such window
was to be found there. Mr Sage there-
upon sends another order to the Over-
seer (N°57a) to the effect that as Vyapoory
Pillay states he saw the window in
question lying at the kutcheri some
time ago, the overseer should enquire
and report whether the said window
was replaced either in the kutcheri or
Police station House, without the know-
ledge of the D. P. W. This Order was
written by Vyapoory Pillay himself,
and signed by Mr Sage, and the Over-
seer in reply to it which reply was
probably copied from or draft furnished
by the Supervisor, as he had been sent
by Mr Sage to enquire about the window,
and was at Satur at that time, states
(N°58) that he again visited the Taluq
kutcheri, in company with an Official of that
kutcheri, and a Bricklayer, Kuppan Pillay,
(who executed certain repairs to the kutcheri
in 1866-67), and found the building to con-
tain the same number of windows as pro-
vided in the Standard Plan for Taluq
kutcheries, except one windows which ap-
peared to have been recently closed. He
the Overseer, was informed that only this
window (in the Record Room) was re-
moved in the year abovementioned,
and that the other window in the
prison-room was allowed to remain
at the request of the Tahsildar. This is
merely hearsay evidence, and is worth-
less, inasmuch as the accounts of the
work executed in the kutcheri in 1866-67.

shew that two windows were removed as provided for in the sanctioned estimate (№ 49). Mr. McClair reports, on the last statement of the Taluq Overseer as above, that one of the windows is averred to be fixed in the Taluq Cutchery, but this window has not been identified either by Mr. Sage or by Mr. McClair or by any one else. It is highly improbable that the iron bars of one of the windows were used in the Range Office Building, as stated by the Supervisor, as no deduction was made on this account in the Bill for the work (№ 66); and as both the S. Accountant (№ 12) and Taluq Overseer's writer (№ 53) declare that they saw both the windows taken away by the Supervisor to Palamcottah, it is quite clear to me from the above

facts that the Supervisor has in this instance proved himself to be dishonest and untrustworthy.

Charge № 4. Here Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay is charged with having submitted false Inspection Reports and thereby drawn Travelling allowance which he was not entitled to. The various halts made by the Supervisor and the false entries in his Inspection Reports from April to July 1871, as mentioned in the 8 petitions (№s 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 9) are particularized in Mr. Sub Engineer's Memo (№ 51). I have made a careful comparison between the Supervisor's Inspection Reports and other documents in the Range Office, and I have found such great discrepancies

and inconsistencies not only as re-
gards the pleces the Supervisor is said
to have halted at, but also the dis-
tances he travelled, each day, that I
consider his inspection Reports to be,
as a Rule, purely fictitious, and that
no reliance whatever can be placed
upon them as to the facts which they
pretend to record. To prove this, a com-
parison has only to be made between
the Supervisor's Inspection Report for
of May 1871, (p. 46) and his statement
at p. 36. The former shews that the
Supervisor was at Satur on the 1st
(p. ) and marched 24 miles to Maraloth
(p. ) that night back) for the purpose of checking
the Taluq Overseer's measurements of
it is of materials in the 54 and 55 miles,

but he states that he was on that day
at Satur, engaged in carrying out work
that had been ordered by the Collector
that morning. On the 2d his Inspection
Report shews that he marched to Koil-
putty a distance of 13 miles; but he
states that on that date he was at
Satur in the forenoon, and in the
afternoon marched to Koilputty, but
recollecting that he had not obtained
funds from the Collector for the work
he was doing, he returned to Satur
the same night. If this be true his
Inspection Report should shew a march
of 26 miles for that day, and not only
13 miles. On the 3d he marched to
Kytour 18 miles inspecting the Road &c.
and halted there for the day accord-
ing to his Inspection Report, but as he

was all that day with the Collector at Satur and the fact cannot be disproved, he now admits this, and states that he was all that day at Satur with the Collector, till about 4 P.M. when he started and marched direct to Kytaur a distance of 31 miles, to make up for lost time. This is clearly a falsehood, which is further proved by the Supervisor's own letter (Ex. 44) in which he distinctly states that on the 3rd he was encamped at Kytaur. Having left Satur at about 4 P.M. on 3rd, the Supervisor could not have inspected the materials under collection and examined the Mile-men's work between Coilputty and Kytaur, nor could he have arrived at the latter place till early next morning the 4th. His Inspection Report shews that on this day he marched 6 miles from Kytaur and halted at Goingudaur. On the 5th he marched to Palamcottah 12 miles. On the 6th he marched to Sevillaperi and back to Palamcottah 16 miles for the purpose of inspecting materials under collection on the road leading from Sevillaperi to Otapedaram. On the 7th he halted at Palamcottah. From the 9th to 13th he was absent at Nagercoil on Casual leave. On the 14th he returned to Palamcottah. On the 15th he left that station and halted at Gairingudaur, Muramber, Vepankulam, Parathikulam and Kytaur, between that date and 21st. The Supervisor

states that from the 5th to 21st the statement in his Inspection Report is correct, but it appears from the petitions and the Head Accountant's deposition (Nº 11) that the Supervisor halted at Palamcottah from 5th to 7th, and from 15th to 21st; and therefore he could not have visited the places, or inspected the works, as shewn in his inspection Report.

The Supervisor states (Nº 36) that on the 22nd which is entered as at Kytaur, he went to Sevillaperi (8 miles distant) in the morning, spent the heat of the day there, and returned to Kytaur in the evening, which is a clear falsehood, as the Inspection Report shews that he did not march on that day at all, but remained at Kytaur

Engaged in Office work. The letter he wrote to me on this date says he was at Sevillaperi, which is another falsehood. On the 23rd he says he marched to, and halted at Eddasheval, 24th at Coilpuitty, and 25th Satur, but it is reported that the Supervisor left Palamcottah only on the night of the 23rd, arrived at Kytaur in the morning and at Coilpuitty in the evening of the 24th, and reached Satur on the 25th, on which day he cashed a cheque for salaries which he had drawn on the 15th at Palamcottah. With all these inconsistencies and false statements before him, Mr. Sage in his Report (Nº 50) remarks that he considers that there are no

grounds for stating, as Mr McNair has done, that the Inspection Report of the Supervisor cannot be relied upon. I am fully convinced that these Reports are not only purely fictitious, but that the Supervisor has by their means, on many occasions, defrauded the Government and drawn Travelling allowance to which he was not entitled.—

Charge No 5. The charge as regards Road No 18 is erroneous, as it is proved that no estimate was submitted for it, and that the slight damages sustained by the road were repaired from the maintenance grants for the same in 1869-70. Besides Road No 14 alluded to in the petitions, four other roads, viz Road 2, Road between Velatte Kulom and Kulathur, Road between Otapidaram and Sevillapery and Road between Otapidaram and Vyppar were breached and damaged by the floods of November 1869, and were repaired the same year and sanctioned estimates. The funds for Roads No 2 and 14 were supplied from the Idol grant by the Collector, but the accounts and Bills of expenditure thereon did not pass through this Office, but were submitted to Controller through the Collector. The Vouchers for the expenditure on the other roads from Imperial funds were forwarded direct to the Controller by the Supervisor. The allotments for all these roads were fully spent accord-

ing to the Copies of the Bills recorded in the Range Office, but I am not prepared to accept the accuracy of these accounts. I am inclined to believe that a portion of the money has been misappropriated as alleged, although no evidence has been elicited to prove the charge.

Charge № 6. This charge is fully proved, and the evidence of Local Fund Overseer (№ 9) the Satur Overseer (№ 10) the Head Accountant (№ 11) the 3rd Accountant (№ 12), Siva Subramania Pillay (№ 18) and late Satur Taluq Overseers Writer (№ 53) all go to shew that the Supervisor's Brother-in-law Subba Pillay was totally unfit to be a Maistry, that he neglected his duties and spent most of his time at Satur—

Vyapoory Pillay admits (№ 36) that his brother-in-law was employed as a maistry for 3 or 4 years, and that on a certain occasion, for want of funds, he had been discharged, but that at the expiration of a few months he was again reappointed at the special request of the Taluq Overseer who had difficulties in obtaining Maistries for the works. The Overseer distinctly denies this (№ 10), and it is evident that the Supervisor employed this man who is quite ignorant and cannot read or write, only because he was his own brother-in-law.

Charge № 7. Whatever foundation of truth there may be in this charge, the accounts have been so prepared as to present the

appearance of disproving it. I have not the least doubt that, as stated in the petition, materials collected in one year have been brought forward and charged for a second time in the following year. The state of the High Road from Madura to Palamcottah, and the Cotton Road from Vembur to Vilicovin is quite sufficient to disprove the truth of the statement of Local Fund Overseer (No 9) and of Salt & Taliaq Overseer (No 10). It is quite impossible to believe that if the sanctioned grants had been fully spent with ordinary care these roads could have deteriorated as they have, or that the Cotton Road could have got into its present disgraceful state.

Charge No 8. This is a true charge, and the Local Fund Overseer's state-

ment No 9 with reference to the quality of the materials and workmanship used in, and the present condition of the Buildings at Velattikulam, is corroborated by Mr Sub Engineer McNair who by my instructions inspected them on the 11th January 1872. He reports (No 70) that the walls of the main building and out offices are cracked in very many places, the result of defective work; the bricks not being properly bonded together, and the chunam joints between them varying from 1/2 to 1/4 inches in thickness. The flooring of the verandah all round the main building is constructed of 9" square bricks laid over a bed of mere lime coss, 4 inches in depth; instead of the square bricks being laid

with 3 inches of stone concrete in chimam
t underneath, as provided in the sanction
ed Estimate, and charged for in the Bill. —
The surfaces of the square bricks is already
much worn away and very uneven. —
The Roof of the Cookroom has moreover
sagged to such an extent that unless
rebuilt it will soon tumble down. The
Chimam borders, on the roofs of the
outoffices especially, are very rough
and unsightly. The materials used
in the Buildings are also of a very
inferior description. Most of the wall
bricks, flooring bricks, flat and pair tiles
are but half burnt, and the chimam
is so very bad that although executed
more than a year ago it has not set as
yet, and is crumbling away. Samples
of these materials are herewith forwarded. ×

× by transit.

The bricks and tiles were obtained from
a distance of 1½ miles, and the chunam
4 miles from the work-spot. The wood 85
for the buildings was obtained from
Tuticorin, a distance of 40 miles, and
the palmyrah rafters from Tuticorin 25
miles. These are of a tolerably good de-
scription. The rates allowed in the
Estimate are fair and reasonable and
sufficient to guarantee superior work. It
is impossible to believe that such defec-
tive work could have been passed by
the Supervisor, without his receiving a
quid pro quo from the Contractor —

Charge No. 9. This charge cannot be proved,
but the present bad condition of the roads
alluded to is sufficiently condemnatory
of the alleged fact. The Supervisor states

(№ 36) that all money given to him "for the maintenance of roads has been fully and fairly spent every year as shewn in the accounts" but I have no belief whatever in the accuracy of these accounts, as I have already stated.

Charge № 10. The Local Fund Overseer (№ 9), the Taluq Overseer (№ 10), the Head Accountant (№ 11), the 3rd account ant (№ 12) and the late Satur Taluq Overseers Writer (№ 53) confirm the allegation in the 4 petitions (№ 2, 6, 7 and 8). — The Supervisor states (№ 36) that in 1865 he purchased a Tent, and had it in use till April 1871, when that tent becoming useless he purchased another which he has now with him; and that he never employed the Government Lascars as his Cook and Bandyman. This statement is untrue. The old tent was converted by the Supervisor into a cover for his bullock-coach, and on my detecting this, he purchased a new Tent, but this was I believe only in August last. — There is sufficient evidence to prove that the Lascars have been occasionally employed by the Supervisor as his Cook and Bandyman. —

Charge № 11. Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay is here charged with having, during the last 5 years, employed a nursery gardener and a Mile-man as his private servants (Cook and horse-keeper). The Supervisor denies the charge (№ 36) as do the gardeners and Maistries (№ 16, 17, 21, 25, 26 and 29) but the Overseers

(Nos 9 and 10) and the Office Subordinates (Nos 11, 12 and 53) confirm the allegation more or less. The proof has not been elicited, but the fact is patent that in the arrangements made by the Supervisor for the Range nursery garden and Roads, the out turn from the former has been simply nil; while the latter have been greatly neglected and are in a wretched condition.—

Charge No 12. Here Vyapoory Pillay is charged with having purchased, for Rs 500, tools, worth less than Rs 100, of a Blacksmith of Madura, who was made to supply all the iron works for the Supervisor's house at Palamcottah. Mr. Sub. Engineer McNair states (No 57) that it is now impossible to ascertain the value of the Tools supplied by the Blacksmith of Satur (formerly of Madura) but judging from what new Tools are left in store, he thinks they have been supplied of the same description, and at the same rates, common in the District. The Supervisor admits (No 36) that the same blacksmith who made the Tools for use in the Range, supplied such iron works as he required for his new house at Palamcottah, and says that he saw no harm in obtaining them from him on payment, and which payments he can prove. The 3d Accountant (No 12) and the late Satur Taluq Overseers Writer (No 53) affirm that the Tools supplied by the said Blacksmith for the Range were paid

for at more than the market prices, to favor the Contractor. With a house constructing at Palamcottah 50 miles away from Satur, where iron is obtainable at cheap rates and excellent blacksmiths are to be found, it is not understood why the Supervisor should employ an upcountry blacksmith to do work with material, which the man has, in the first instance to obtain from Palamcottah. It is impossible to believe that the Supervisor would have acted in this manner, unless he benefitted himself in some way by the arrangement. The charge has certainly a fraudulent aspect.

re Charge No 13. Here the Supervisor he is charged with having destroyed and falsified his Cash Book, to screen his fraudulent transactions. This case, together with charge Nos 1, as above, was without any requisition from me, inquired into by the Head Assistant Magistrate of Tinnevelly, nor has the result been communicated to me. Mr Mc Nair states (No 51) that the Cash Book was not rebound with a bad motive, and Mr Sage agrees with him (No 50). The Supervisor states (No 61) that the book was rebound twice; the first time, because the Cash Book got worn, and the leaves became loose, and the second time, because the Moochee, in rebinding it on the first occasion, cut away some of the totalled figures at the foot of the pages.

The Head Accountant also admits (at 62) that the Book was rebounded twice, but assigns a different reason for the book having been rebounded the first time. It was done, he says, not to screen any fraud, but to present a clean book to the Controller. Manager, the original cash book (at 54) having contained several corrections corresponding with those in the 3 Bills (at 63 & 65). These corrections were made in the Cash Books, Bills and Cash abstract of disbursements as the Head Accountant avers (at 62) after payment of the amounts by the Supervisor; but the Supervisor does not remember (at 61) whether they were made before or after payment. It is evident that the corrections were made after payment, as the Original Cash book (at 54) now contains no corrected pages, fresh pages having been introduced in rebinding it and re-written in lieu of them. The necessity for the corrections made in the aforesaid documents is explained by the Head Accountant, whose statement (at 62) I have no reason to doubt. He avers that no work was executed in the Chapediarum Perakulam (tank) at the time the amount of Bill for Rupees 108-7-3 for work executed in Sheralkulam was suddenly transferred to the former tank; that Madasawmy Pillay was not the Contractor for the Chapediarum Perakulam, and that the measurements of the work were antedated and forwarded about a

month after the amount was charged
in the Bill. The corrections in the
Bills, the Supervisor attributes to clerical errors, as frequently such mistakes occur in writing out Bills, and adds (Ex: 61) that the original entries and the corrections in the two Bills (Ex: 64 and 65) were written by the Local Fund Overseer Samuel Pillay, and the order to the Overseer for making the corrections was given by him; and further that the work in Attapedaram Perakulam, which had been given to Elladasamy Pillay, was taken away from him, because he did not carry out the work rapidly, and given to another Contractor named Chapparni Pillay.

This statement cannot be true, for according to the Supervisor's own deposition (Ex: 61) the work charged in Bill for Rs 108-7-3. Viz for 1735 Cubic Yards of earthwork (Ex: 63) was executed by 66 Coolies working Pillay in 7 days; that is between the 1st and 7th January 1871, this work was executed, measured up and paid. The Records of the office shew that the above mentioned payment of Rs 108-7-3 to this Contractor was the first and only payment made to him for the work in question. It has been clearly proved that the Cash Book the most important document in the Range office was corrected, rewritten and rebound twice, and that no report

of the circumstance was made to the Superintending Engineer, or to the Controller, or to his Manager (Cts 61 and 62) or proceeding on the part of the Supervisor, which is highly improper and unwarrantable, especially when it is taken into consideration that the 3rd page of the old cash book, bearing the Countersignature of the Superintending Engineer in token of his inspection of the same, was bound up with the new cash book (Ct 55). He is guilty of not only of having rewritten and rebound the Cash book twice as stated above, but also of having destroyed the original cash book, abstract of Receipts and disbursements for 1870-71. The entries in these books were corrected to correspond with the corrections made in the Cash book, but as the Supervisor was unwilling to shew them in that condition to the Controllers Manager, the Cash book having already been rewritten and rebound, he ordered the Accountant to copy them in the Cash Abstract Books for 1869-70, as there was plenty of room in them for the entries, and he then destroyed the Books. Vide the Depositions of Head Accountant Nallasivem Pillay (Ct 62) and late Satur Taluq Overseers Writer Venkatachellam Iyengar (Ct 53). There are several inconsistencies in the Supervisors statement (Ct 61) with regard to these books. He first says that the books have been lost from the Office room in his house

about six months ago, July 1871; and then he deposes that in June 1871, he gave the books into the hands of the Head Accountant, and about 5 months afterwards (November 1871), was given to understand that the Accountant had returned them, and had placed them on his office table. Again, he deposes that he considered these Books as rough Drafts, and afterwards states that the books of the pattern supplied by the Controller were never used as Rough Drafts. This Head Accountants statement (Ex. 62), and which is corroborated by the late Paluy Overseers Writer (Ex. 53) is, that the original Cash Abstract Books for 1870-71, after being recopied in February 1871, into the Books

for 1869-70 were taken away by the Superviser and kept in his house, that five months afterwards the Superviser sent the books to the Range Office, but as he (Accountant) did not wish to keep them in the Office, because they were partially destroyed and useless, he at once returned them to the Superviser. He also adds that before giving over charge of the Range to Mr Sage, Vyapoory Pillay told him that the books were with him, and that he would produce them if required; that he therefore included the books in the List of Office records taken over by Mr Sage which list was signed by Mr Sage and Vyapoory Pillay, and is recorded in

the Office I believe the Supervisor has concealed or destroyed, the original Cash Abstract Books for 1870-71, as they would, if produced, disprove the statement made by him with reference to the corrections in the Bills, and the payment of the amounts thereof. I consider the Supervisor's proceedings in connexion with the Cash Book, and the cash abstract Books for 1870-71, highly irregular, unwarrantable and unpardonable.—

Charge № 14. Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay is here charged with having drawn pay for 20 Maistries, two years ago, and appropriated to himself Rs 120 of the money thus drawn.

The Acquittance Rolls for the 8 months of December 1867 and January 1868 (№s 38, and 39) prove that the salaries of 13 Maistries were raised by two Rupees each, and the average monthly expenditure under the head Petty Establishment by about Rs 50 for those two months. The Head Accountant (№ 11), the 3d Accountant (№ 12) and the Overseers writer (№ 53) state that the Supervisor paid the Maistries their usual salaries for the abovementioned two months, and kept back the difference, promising to supply them with cloths, that with a portion of the money kept back, he purchased a few cloths of the value of about Rs 20, which he kept in the Office for some time, and then took

them away and that he never gave them to the maistries. The Supervisor states (№ 36) that the amounts entered in the Acquittance Rolls were actually paid to the Maistries, as acknowledged by three of them (№s 23 to 25), and adds that he did purchase at his own cost, 'cloths' to the value of upwards of Rs 100, to present to the Maistries, as an encouragement, and kept some of them in the Office for some time, but that he afterwards changed his mind about it, and sold most of the 'cloths', retaining one or two for his own use. This is a highly improbable statement, and the fact of a few 'cloths' having been kept three years in the Revenue Office, Viz from January 1868 to January 1871, gives the transaction a very suspicious aspect. I am inclined to believe that the charge is a true one, and that the Supervisor has, in this instance, defrauded the Government and the maistries of Rs 50, the difference of the salaries charged for, and those actually paid, and not Rs 120, as stated in the petitions.—



Charge № 15. Here Supervisor Vyepoory Pillay is accused of having, in March 1871, fraudulently charged Rs 6,000 in the accounts for the works alleged to have been executed in the Otapedaram Tank, while no work had

been executed.—This is of course native Hyperbole,—as the Rangel accounts shew that the total expenditure in the above Taluq in March 1871, on all works of Irrigation and Communication, was only Rs 4,748.—The Office Subordinates know nothing about the charge, but the 3rd Accountant (№ 12) states that he is aware that the repairs to the Otapedaram Perakulam and the Ravee embankment at Satiri were not executed to the extent charged for in the accounts for March 1871; and that the works were completed subsequently, but that he is unable to prove it by the documents in the Office. It is probable that the Petitioners refer to some such transactions connected with the works in the Otapedaramm Taluq, and charged for in the accounts of March 1871, which, of course, cannot be proved at the present time.

Charge № 16. Here Vyapoory Pillay is charged with having taken the Government Lascars with him to Travancore on account of his own marriage and kept them there for 20 days without authority. The Superintendent admits this, and states (№ 36) that he took the Lascars with him with the permission of the Superintending Engineer, but there is nothing on record to verify this statement. The Superintendent who went to Travancore on leave, certainly ought not to have taken away the Lascars from the Rangé.

Charge № 17. Here Superintendent Vyapoory Pillay

is charged with having misappropri-
:ated, Rs 75, the sale proceeds of 300,
bunches of plantains, obtained from
the Nursery garden at Nemmaney.
Mr. Sub Engineer Mc Nair who in-
:spected the garden believes that the
charge is greatly exaggerated, and
that the grantity of good plantains
actually obtained from the Nurser-
was sold for a trifle, and the money
spent on the purchase of ropes and
baling baskets for the garden. The
Head Accountant (№ 11) the 3rd
accountant (№ 12) the Overseer's writer
(№ 53) and the Local Fund Over-
seer (№ 9) support the allegation in
the Petitions and it is therefore probable

though sufficient proof has not been
elicited, that a larger quantity of
plantains has been obtained from
the Nurseries at Katur and Nemma-
:ney, and that the sale proceeds have
been misappropriated, as stated in
the petitions.

Charge № 18. Pere Vyapoory Pillay is charged
with having fraudulently employed
Monistries for Local Fund Works at a
cost of Rs 37 per mensem, instead of
appointing a permanent Maistry on
Rs 20, as sanctioned by the Superintend-
:ing Engineer. There are no permanent
Local Fund Maistries in the Range,
and the Supervisor states (№ 36) that
they were not appointed by the Super-
:intending Engineer and that he re-

members receiving instructions from the Superintending Engineer not to employ them. There is nothing on record to verify this most improbable statement.

Charge № 19. This charge is that Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay submitted several emergent Estimates for repairing the Nurseries along Road № 2, and appropriated the sanctioned amounts to himself without executing the repairs. The Overseers and Office Subordinates know nothing about this charge, because the accounts were not prepared, or copies of them retained in the Office. The Supervisor states (№ 36) that in November 1869, an Estimate of about Rs 100 was sanctioned by the Collector for repairing 3 Nurseries on Road № 2, that the repairs were carried out by a Road Maistry, and that the accounts of expenditure were sent, through the Tahsildar, to the Collector. There is no record of this transaction in the Range Office, nor is there any evidence to prove the charge.

Charge № 20. This charge is that Vyapoory Pillay has purchased Lands at Gaingindan for Rs 6,000, but has excluded the same from the Return forwarded by him to the Superintending Engineer. The Local Fund Overseer (№ 9), the Head Accountant (№ 11), and 3rd Accountant (№ 12) state from hearsay, that the Supervisor possesses Lands at Gaingindan. The Satur Taluq Overseer

(№10) is aware that the Supervisor had lands there, until 4 or 5 months ago, when he gave them up. This is corroborated by the Satur Taluq Circle's Writer (№53), who adds that he has seen Paddy and dry grain taken in carts from Gaingundaiir to the Supervisor's house in Satur; but he does not know whether the lands are still in his possession or not. There appears no doubt but that the Supervisor held these lands, but that he gave them up on my commencing this enquiry.

Charge №21. This charge is that Contractor Sappinney Pillay, who constructed the Sub-Jail at Velattikulam and obtained a large profit from that work, has built, at his own cost, a large house worth Rs 5,000 for Vyapoory Pillay at Viniarpettah. The Local Fund Overseer (№9) and the Head Accountant (№11) state from that the Contractor supplied a quantity of wood and chunam for the Supervisor's new house, while the 3rd Accountant (№12) states that he saw the Contractor's brother-in-law and some of his men, working at the house. The Contractor declares (№35) that he has not contributed funds, or materials for the Building, but that his son-in-law superintended its construction, as a Mastry, and received a monthly salary of Rs 15 from the Supervisor. This statement cannot be true. I am in

claimed to believe that the Contractor supplied a portion of the materials required for the new houses gratis, finds that his son-in-law did not receive pay for superintending its construction.

Charge № 22. Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay is here charged with having employed two men, who were paid as Kangonies on Road № 16, to do his private work for the last two years. The Superviser denies (№ 36) having employed any Government Servant, at any time, as his private servant. Mr. Sub Engineer Mc Nair thinks the Kangonies named Arumiah has been occasionally employed by the Superviser as his postman, or as an additional Lascar. The evidence, however, of two Overseers (№s 9 and 10) two office Subordinates (№s 11 and 12) the Overseers Writer (№ 53) and of Sirad Subbroyanian Pillay (№ 18) all go to prove that this Kangoney, Arumiah, had been habitually employed on work, more or less private and not in any way connected with the Roads, from the maintenance grants of which he was paid.

Charge № 23. Here Vyapoory Pillay is charged with having ordered the Maistries to supply him with straw, vegetables, &c., and with having fined them when they failed to do so. The Overseers and Office Subordinates know nothing about this charge, and of five Maistries who were questioned by Mr. Mc Nair, do not admit that they ever

supplied the Supervisor with straw and vegetables. I am not prepared to believe that the charge is false, but that the truth regarding it cannot be elicited.

Charge № 24. This charge is that Local Fund Overseer Samuel Pillay spent many days at Palameottah in May last, without the permission of the Superintending Engineer, but with the consent of the Supervisor. The Satur Taluq Overseer (№ 10) and two office subordinates (№s 11 and 12) state that the Local Fund Overseer often went to Palamcottah, but whether with or without leave, they do not know. The Local Fund Overseer admits (№ 9) that in September 1870 he went to Palamcottah and stayed there



8 or 10 days with the Supervisor's permission. It seems clear that Vyapoory Pillay has been in the habit of granting leave of this description to his subordinates, which of course was very improper.

Charge № 25. This charge is that the Satur Taluq Overseer alone receives sums of from Rs 400 to Rs 500 from Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay for disbursements on works, while no similar funds are entrusted to the other Overseers of the Range. This charge has not been proved.

Charge № 26. This charge is that Satur Taluq Overseer Gopala Pillay has been fined by the Superintending Engineer, for having submitted a false Inspection Report. The Overseer admits this (№ 10)

and says that he was mulcted in his pay and Travelling allowance for 9 days in February 1871, because he had been to Madura without permission. The Supervisor states (Nº 36) that he was not aware when forwarding the Overseer's Inspection Report for February 1871, that he had been to Madura, which statement is not true, as it is not likely that the Overseer would have absented himself from his Taluq for 9 days, without leave, if the Supervisor was not in the habit of granting such unauthorized leaves to his subordinates. The Overseer's Writer (Nº 53) states that the Overseer had been to Madura with the permission of the Supervisor

Charge Nº 27. The Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay is charged with having, in 1866, received from one Alagiri Naiken of Velliapuram in Sattur Taluq, a sum of Rs 200 under false pretences. The statement of the above individual (Nº 67) is that in 1866 he gave the Supervisor Rs 200, which sum had been demanded of him as a moiety of the cost of lowering the body of the Balingulah in Sirtungal Tank, the Supervisor having promised to write to the Higher authorities and to get sanction for the work being done; that subsequently he went several times to the Supervisor, and demanded that either the work should be executed or the money refunded,

and was invariably informed by him that orders had not been received and further that the last demand for refund of the money was made by him about the middle of June 1871, when the Supervisor ordered him to be pushed out of his house. Aligiri Naiken's petition (No 67) was referred to the Deputy Magistrate of Tinnevelly for enquiry and disposal. The Deputy Magistrate, in transmitting the proceedings held before him and the Sub Magistrate of Satur, states (No 68) that as Aligiri Naiken failed to prove the payment, and as he did not mention the circumstance in any of his petitions to the Higher Authorities, or even to him, when the subject of



lowering the Calinguleh was under inquiry in his Office from December 1866 to November 1868, he does not see sufficient grounds for summoning Vijapoory Pillay to answer the charge preferred against him, especially after such laches on the part of the petitioner. Although the charge has not been proved I have little doubt in my mind that it is a true one. The Supervisor connexion with the Petitioner Aligiri Naik began in the year 1863, when Major Paxton was District Engineer of Tinnevelly and Vijapoory Pillay the Head Writer in his office. In the same year Aligiri Naik forwarded his first petition (Enclosure A of Mr Sage's letter No 68) to Government praying that the Cal.

inqulab in Tintingal Tank might
be lowered, when the Supervisor gave
Aligiri Naik a portion of the
draft of the said petition on two pieces
of paper (Enclosures B and C of Mr Sages
letter No 68) though he now states not
gave it to Aligiri Naik's Vakeel Rev.
Nagam Pillay (Enclosures I and J
en of Mr Sages letter No 68) and at the
same time probably received from
Aligiri Naik the stated sum of
Rs 200, promising to use his influence
with the Higher authorities and to have
the work done. Major Paseton however
who inspected the Tank soon afterwards
declined to recommend the lowering
of the Balingulah, on the ground
that the capacity of the tank would
thereby be diminished, and the lands
under it would suffer from want of
water. In 1864, the Supervisor was put
in charge of the late 4th Range, and
from that time up to 1868, Aligiri Naik
forwarded several petitions to the
Government, the Superintending Engineer
and the Collector, on the subject of the
Balingulah, and this he did probably
at the instigation of the Supervisor,
who continued to hold out promises to
him of eventually getting the work done.
In 1866 the Supervisor furnished Aligiri
Naik with a sketch of the Tintingal
Tank, prepared under his orders, by the
2nd Accountant of the Range Office, to be
forwarded with his petition to the Head
Assistant Collector. In 1868 one of Aligiri

etaik's petitions having been referred to the Supervisor, he reported in a letter to the Superintending Engineer dated 28th August 1868, that the late District Engineer Major Paxton had, in 1863, after inspecting the tank, declined to interfere in the matter, that similar petitions were presented to every successive Engineer with the same result; and that in his opinion the lowering of the Calingalah would prove prejudicial to the lands under the tank. This report, it may be inferred was made by the Supervisor without the knowledge of the Petitioners. On the 17th September 1868, the Government passed an order to the effect that they saw no reason for the interference by the Department of Public Works: This order, which must have been forwarded to the Supervisor for transmission to Sligire Saik, was not communicated to him, as otherwise the petitioner would not have been in a position to enter into a compromise with the ryots of Sirtungal tank, as he appears to have done in November of the same year (et 68) that the Calingalah was ordered to remain as it was. After this, Sligire Saik must have been more pressing than before, for refund of the money he had paid in 1863; but when he made the last demand, in June last, and in lieu of receiving back his money,

he was pushed out of the Supervisor's house, he had no alternative but to for-
ward the petition to my address dated July 1871 (Ex. 67). I have no reason to
doubt the correctness of Aligiri Naik's statement, except that instead of admit-
ting that he gave the Supervisor the Rs 200 in 1863, as a doucent for lower-
ing the Calingulah in Tirtungal Tank, he makes it appear from fear of being punished himself, that he gave the money in 1866 as a contribution for the work.

The Deputy Magistrate in his letter (Ex. 68) further states that Aligiri Naik in a petition forwarded to him by post on the 23rd August 1871, informed him that the Tahsildar of

"Satur, who made a preliminary en-
"quiry into the charge, had used threats
towards him and his witnesses, and
that in consequence, two out of the
four witnesses cited by him denied
all knowledge of the payment, and
that the subordinates of the Range
office had been bribed to make a
similar statement. The Deputy
Magistrate also says that on the
"28th Idem Aligiri Naik produced be-
"fore him a sum of money tied in
"his cloth, stating it to be Rs 110, paid to
"him in behalf of Tyapoory Pillay
"by one Devakannoo Pillay, who pro-
"mised to pay the balance of Rs 90, on

his (Aliagiri Naik) denying the trans-
mission of the aforesaid petition by
post". Supervisor Thyapoory Pillay ac-
knowledges (enclosure J. of Mr. Sages letter
(No. 69) that he gave the drafts on
the two pieces of paper (B and C) in
1863, because he cannot but admit
that they are in his own hand
writing, but he denies having fur-
nished the sketch of the Tirtungal
Tank, and says he never saw the
one (marked D) until it was shewn
to him by Mr. Sage. This latter state-
ment is false. The Supervisor admits
that he did order Lalah Meeah (now
Jr. Accountant) to make a survey of the
Tank and the fields under it, as he

had received a petition from some
ryots asking him to build a Calingu
lah across the surplus channel from
Calingulah of Tirtungal Tank to
irrigate certain lands belonging to
them under it, but as he afterwards
found out from the Tahsildar that
it was unnecessary, he never called
for the plan. This is another falsehood.
As the evidence of Lalah Meeah (E),
of Head Accountant Nallasiveia
Pillay (No. 71) of Aliagiri Naiks Vakeel
Sriniviagam Pillay (I), the affidavit
of Overseers Writer Venkatachellama
Iyengar (No. 72), the sketch itself and
the Remarks thereon (D.) all go to
prove that the sketch was prepared

with reference to the lowering of the Calingulah in Portingal Tank, and not to the construction of a new Dam across the surplus channel of that Tank; and that the Supervisor directly or indirectly, furnished Aligiri Naik with a copy of the same, to accompany his petition to the Head Assistant Collector in 1866.

I Taking into consideration all the foregoing facts and circumstances in connexion with the Supervisors Conduct and proceedings while in charge of the late 4th Range, and with the proofs elicited with reference to the other charges preferred against him, I am inclined to believe that this charge, although not proved before the Deputy Magistrate, is a true one.

Rich. H. Roberts
Lt. Col. R.E.
Superintg Engineer 8th Div.

P. W. 622/72.

From 31 May 1872 to 8491

No. 293 Saint Vincent Penn
January 31st 1871

From Officer in charge
Northern Range
Trinidad Station

To The Superintending Engineer
3rd Division
Madeira

Sir, I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your No 4/153 of 26th Inst., & am glad to find that the meaning attached by you to the words "as there is a very serious allegation" is not what I took it to be, & was only to those words I took objection, not to the document for explanation which you of course, have a perfect right to.

2 — I could not have continued this correspondence but with my usual success I appear to have conveyed quite a different meaning to that intended & thought necessary to explain, by you directed me to enquire into a certain matter, & ask the witness certain questions regarding what I believe to be an important point connected with it; for instance I ask a man his name, he replies that in the year 862 his grandfather lived in England I do not think I am bound to

wish down such as evidence
therefore finding how the man
records the topic I wish to
discuss, I came on a long con-
versation with him till I think
I have obtained all I want to
can get from him on the subject
& then left him, if you mean
to say with reference to such a
thing, no & so, after perhaps yes
& put it down & considered this
own answer in his own words,
& he says no I have to go on
the ground till I do find out
what he means & then I
take what he means & then
write it down.

3 — Regarding Latterpad
of Jan 4th of your summary
all evidence taken by me is
not on oath, & neither has
no objection to do so during
evening, but not his purpose,
whether taken in his own
words or not, & has before
expressed to me.

4 — Britain 5 you have
misunderstood me I de-
sired both the R.s meaning you
have just made only.

5 — both reference totality
part of panel I have thrown
before out Mr McNair made
the enquiry I only occasionally
appeared with the matter from
all that I know I had before
as related in my covering
letter that the [illegible]

in by Mr McNair was correct,
& is just possible somebody
told untruths & that all are
true false, & all events Mr
McNair could not detect it
nor could I & as he has been
engaged in all the former in-
quiries in which you were
latterfied, it is my conviction
I should fail totally in this
& I avoided enlightening in me
on all as much as possible
& even on his report till it
was written, the evidence he
took I sent myself home
to him for perusal.

I have the honor to
be
Sir
Your most obed. Servt
[illegible]
Sheriff
Clerk

Enclosures in a letter
from the Supt Engr
& Dr to the Secy
to Govt P W D
No 4332 dated
5th February, 1872

P. W. 67/72.

Letter from
Mr Serge Eccles.
Asst Engr Northern
Range Division

Transmitting Mysterable Survey

Superintg Engineers Office D.P.
No 4534 Dte Calcutta Fort William 19th Feby 1872

From

Lieut. Colonel H. A. Roberts R.E.
Superintg Engineer P.W.D.

To

Colonel J. Carpendale R.E.
Secretary to Government P.W.D.

Sir,

Enc: 2/
1 Petition.
1 Service Register

At the request contained in the accompanying petition from Supervisor Rajaporey Pilgs. dated the 13th Instant I have the honor herewith to submit a copy of his Service Register as found recorded in the books of this Office.

2. Having already fully reported upon Rajaporey Pilgs. case in my letter to Government No 4195 dated 30th January 1872, I have nothing further to add thereto, and it remains for the Government to dispose of

Rec'd 5th February 1872
Encls 1 & 1

Dated 5th February 1872
Rec'd 8th "
Encls 1 & 1

From Lieut. Colonel H. A. Roberts R.E.
Superintg Engineer P.W.D.

To Colonel J. Carpendale R.E.
Secretary to Government P.W.D.

Sir,

At the request contained in the accompanying petition from Supervisor Rajaporey Pilgs. dated the 13th Instant I have the honor herewith to submit a copy of his Service Register as found recorded in the books of this Office.

2. Having already fully reported upon Rajaporey Pilgs. case in my letter to Government No 4195 dated 30th January 1872, I have nothing further to add thereto, and it remains for the Government to dispose of

Encl: 2/
1 Petition.
1 Service Register

Dy. 187 & Copyist
Dispatched 3 3 2
Comm

No 657.

The Secretary to Govt
of Bengal
Public Dept

Sir,

I am directed by Govr
to acknowledge the receipt
of your letter No 4534
dated 19th ultimo
forwarding the Service
Register of Supervisor
Rajaporey Pilgs.

2. In reply I am to
inform you that the
Register has been
returned to the Govt
Record Office.

I have &c
H. Beverley
Offg Secy to Govt
of Bengal

Calcutta the 22nd February 1872

To Lieut. Colonel H. A. Roberts R.E.
Superintg Engineer P.W.D.

the Service according to its merits.
I will not, however refrain from remarking on the present occasion that Vyapoory Pillay proved himself indeed an excellent public servant, as testified by the several Officers under whom he served, so long as his services were confined to Office duties, but that when promoted to the Executive Branch, and placed in a position (as Superviser in charge of a Range) where it was within his competency to help himself to Government funds, he has not scrupled to take advantage of that position, to do so, and to benefit himself in such a manner, coupled with [illegible] as I believe [illegible] have ever attempted

[illegible] quite possible, that Para 7 of this letter

nearly every one who has given evidence against him has applied for much money, but it is stated more probable that many of those who have not given evidence against him have been bought off by him. This indeed is currently reported. And although he may affect to rail at the "dishonest customs and corrupt practices of the generality of the Natives of this Division", I think it would be difficult to find even among a money loving race such as the Hindoos proverbially are, a man in whom the curse of greed "rem quocunque modo rem" is more thoroughly ingrained. Vyapoory Pillay presents to me the attributes peculiar to all misers. The yearning to clutch money at all hazards - money which he has not the heart to spend - and which he is afraid to shew,

so that while wearing the outward appearance the air of a true gentleman, he can revel in secret over his ill-gained hoards. Such men, however interesting to other students of human nature, are clearly unsuited for situations of trust under a Government who expect, and have a right to claim, common honesty and integrity of purpose from those individuals whom they may be pleased to select for situations such as that in which the Fellow was placed.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obt Servant
Robt Rogers Lieut: Col: R.E.
Superintg Engineer 8 Div.

Enclosure 1. In a letter from the Superintg Engineer 8th Division to the Secretary to Government dated 19th February 1872 No 4534.

P. W. 973/72.

Petition

From 31st May 72 L.B.N. 493

From Dy. No. 1872 Engineers Branch No. 1534
Dated 9th Feby 1872
Received 26 —

To the Secretary to Government Bombay

Sir

I have the honor to forward herewith for the information & decision of Government a petition from Rajaram Vyapoory Pillay praying that he may be allowed to proceed to Tinnevelly to defend himself against the charges preferred against him.

2. I have also the honor to forward herewith a petition from Vyapoory Pillay praying that he may be allowed to proceed to Tinnevelly to defend himself against the charges preferred against him.

3. I have the honor to be Sir Your most obedient servant

Engineer & Surveyor General

Dated 13th Feby 1872
Rec'd 14th Feby 1872

From Vyapoory Pillay
Suspension of the Tinnevelly Dist.

Prays that this Petition may be forwarded to Government for their favorable consideration in respect to the charges preferred against him.

Filed

Name. Vyapoory Pillay. age when first entertained 22 years.

| Establishment | Date of appointment | Salary | Period of service in each appointment: Years | Months | Days | Remarks regarding punishments Severe and & formal reprimands and all Special commendations or marks of approbation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | 5 |
| Civil Engr 8th Dn. | 1st September 1856. | Head Estimatemaker and Accountant | 55 | | | |

6

The Bearer Vyapoory Pillay Head Writer in the Civil Engineers Office 8th Dn. has by his Shrewdness, diligence, and activity been of the greatest assistance to me while employed as Acting Civil Engineer 8th Dn. from the 23rd October 1855 to this date.

Knowing intimately all the duties connected with the Office, and the various correspondence that has taken place on all kinds of Subjects, he does his duty as Head of the Office, in a very Satisfactory manner.

I could be very glad to hear of his being able to obtain a greater increase of Salary and a better appointment, than that offered to him in the newly Sanctioned Establishment.

Cosmafortpoorum 28th August 1856 } (Signed) R. A. Roberts Lieut. 3. Acting Civil Engineer 8th Dn.

During the short time (29th August to 8th November 1856) that I had the honor of being in charge of the Civil Engineers Office attached to the Tinnevelly District. I found Vyapoory Pillay the Head Writer a particularly smart and attentive man.

He has held his present appointment for many years and is well worthy of filling a higher post which I hope he will be fortunate enough to obtain when the contemplated changes in the Maramut Department are sanctioned.

Palamcottah. 13th November 1856 } (Signed) G. M. Payne Lieut. 2d Assistant Civil Engineer 8th Dn.

To,

The Superintending Engineer
8th Division
Madura.

Sir

I most respectfully beg to bring a few things to your notice in connection with the Charges that have lately been brought against me, a report of which, it believe, has been submitted to Government by your honor.

2. You are perhaps aware that I have served Government for upwards of twenty five years commencing from 15th November 1847. For the last seven years I have been in the Executive branch of the P.W.D. as a Supervisor in charge of the 4th Range, and nearly all the other eighteen years in the Office branch as Head Writer &c &c &c in the Civil and Superintending Engrs Offices

3. During the time, I was Head Writer I received from time to time testimonials from the officers under whom I served regarding my ability and honesty. The manner I have behaved during the seven years I was in the Executive branch may be seen from the Service Register in your Office

4. Your honor is perhaps well aware of the provincial dishonesty, and in the truthfulness of the generality of the natives in this Division — the Conclusion they form to get any post subordinate into

into trouble and may be distasteful to them-
or who may try to put a stop to any of their
dishonest or long established Customs and Cor-
rupt practices, and indeed few, if any,
Noble Gentlemen in your honors position
are able to find out.

5. Such being the case I most earnestly
beg that your honor will be kindly pleased
to Consider what induced the Overseers
and Accountants lately under me in the
4th Range to Conspire against unanimously
as they have done.

6. If I had wished to be dishonest
as the abovementioned Subordinates, desire
to make out, nothing would have been easier
than to have Combined with them to do so.
But it is just because I have Kept them in
their proper Places & given them no chance
of filling their pockets dishonestly — that
they now Conspire to get me into serious
trouble. They first Commenced to send
to your honor anonymous petitions usually
the first step with such infamous persons.
With such Cunning and plausible stories
do they make up a Case against the poor
Subordinate that even the wisest Gentlemen
will often be led astray by them.

7. Another Cause of their getting up Cases
against a Subordinate is their greed of
money. The very men who first set up a
Complaint are the very people to Come &
offer to hush the matter up for a good
round sum - knowing to the sorrow of a poor
miserable Subordinate. Once this Case was
made up against me I have had numerous hints
thrown out by nearly every one who has given
evidence against me, that for a certain sum
the matter would be hushed up and every one
would give evidence in my favor. I there-
fore beg your honor should Consider the general
character and antecedents of the people who
have tried to injure me.

8. Upon Page the first Confidential
Report upon my Case, I am told, made a
favorable report but as I got no Copy of it
nor of the final Report your honor sent to Go-
vernment I therefore beg your honor to
favor me with the Copies of these two Reports.

9. In Conclusion I beg that your honor
will be kind enough to send this Communi-
cation to Government with a Copy of my
Service Register with any favorable remarks
your honor may think fit.

I beg to remain
Sir,
your most obed.t & humble
Servant.
Upon from Billy
Supt. Tinnevelly
District.

13th February
1872.

Name. P.Vyapoory Pillay. age when first entertained 22 years.

| Establishment | Date appointment | | Salary | Period of Service in each appointment: years | months | Days | Remarks regarding punishments severe and formal reprimands and all Special Commendations or marks of approbation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | 5 | | 6 |
| Civil Engr. 8th Dn. | 15th November 1847 | 1st Writer in the Assistant Civil Engineer's Office. | 30 | " | " | " | P.Vyapoory was with me from 15th November 1847 to 30th April 1850 during which period he marched about the Districts of Madura and Tinnevelly and did the duty of a 1st Writer in the Assistant Civil Engineer's Office he can write a neat hand, understands the Office routine, he can take down measurements of work executed both of earth and masonry, he could draw plans tolerably well when he left me and would I think have improved with further practice, he had then just commenced learning to lay down a Survey from the Survey Book, but had not Studied the use of any Surveying instrument.<br>He worked willingly and diligently while with me since which time he has been employed as 1st Writer in the Civil Engineer's Office 8th Dn.<br>He can Estimate for earth and Masonry works.<br>South Arcot District.<br>Chellumbrum Taluk<br>Vullathoray 15th April 1852 } (Signed) P. Connel 2nd Lieut 1st Asst Civil Engineer 8th Dn. |
| D: | 1st May 1850. | Head Writer & Accountant in the Civil Engineers Office 8th Division | 50 | " | " | " | The holder of this paper Vyapoory Pillay served under me as Head Writer & Accountant from the 1st May 1850 to 22nd October 1855 having previously acted as Office Mairsty to the 2nd Assistant Civil Engineer, and I have great pleasure in testifying to his diligence in the performance of his duties as well as to his general good conduct. I consider him a good public Servant and well worthy of promotion in the new Department of Public Works.<br>Madura<br>22nd October 1855 } (Signed) W. P. Horsley. Capn Civil Engineer 8th Dn. |

Name. Vyapoory Pillay. age when first entertained 22 years.

| Establishment | Date of appointment | Salary | Period of service in each appointment: Years | Months | Days | Remarks regarding punishments severe and formal reprimands and also all Special commendations or marks of approbation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | | | 5 |
| Civil Engr 8th Dn | 1st September 1856. | Head Estimatemaker and Accountant | 55 | | | The Dearer Vyapoory Pillay Head Writer in the Civil Engineers Office 8th Dn has by his Shrewdness, diligence, and activity been of the greatest assistance to me, while employed as Acting Civil Engineer 8th Dn from the 23rd October 1855 to this date.<br>Knowing intimately all the duties connected with the Office, and the various correspondence that has taken place on all kinds of Subjects, he does his duty as Head of the Office in a very Satisfactory manner.<br>I could be very glad to hear of his being able to obtain a greater increase of Salary and a better appointment, than that lately offered to him in the newly Sanctioned |

Establishment.

Cavnia Jurisdiction 28th August 1856. } (Signed) R. A. Roberts Lieut. 3. Acting Civil Engineer 8th Dn

During the short time (29th August to 8th November 1856) that I had the honor of being in charge of the Civil Engineers Office attached to the Tinnevelly District. I found Vyapoory Pillay the Head Writer a particularly smart and attentive man.

He has held his present appointment for many years and is well worthy of filling a higher post which I hope he will be fortunate enough to obtain when the contemplated changes in the Maramut Department are sanctioned.

Palamcottah. 13th November 1856. } (Signed) G. M. Payne Lieut. 2d Assistant Civil Engineer 8th Dn

Vyapoory Pillay age when 1st entertained 22 years.

| Establishment | Date | appointment | Salary | Period of service in each appointment: Years | Months | Days | Remarks regarding punishments Severe and formal reprimands and all Special Commendations Marks of approbation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | 6. |
| | | | | | | | The Bearer Vyapoory Pillay has been the Head Accountant in my Office for more than 2 years and his Services in that capacity have been invaluable to me. He is thoroughly acquainted with the duties of his Post & active & zealous in their discharge. He is a first rate Accountant and Estimate maker and is so thoroughly acquainted with the District and all that has been done in it for many years that his loss could not be repaired for many a year – but as his talents and zeal render him eligible for a far higher and more responsible post I have been endeavouring to procure one for him but unfortunately without success. |
| Palamcottah | | | | | | | (Signed) R. P. Oakes. Capt |
| January 17: 1859 | 3 | Engineers | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Vyapurii Pillai Estimatemaker and Head Accountant in the District Engineers Office Pinnevelly entered the Department in the year 1847. He has served under the present Chief Engineer Captain O. Connel, Roberts and Oakes from all of whom he has received high testimonials. He is well acquainted with the Pinnevelly and Madura Districts. |
| | | | | | | | Vyapurii Pillai is an excellent Accountant, a good Estimatemaker and conducts the work of the Office in a very Satisfactory manner. |
| | | | | | | | He is anxious to obtain a higher post than the one he now |

Vyapoory Pillay age when 1st entertained 22 years.

| Establishment | Date appointment | Salary | Period of service in each appointment: Years | Months | Days | Remarks regarding punishments severe and formal Reprimands and all Special commendations or marks of approbation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

holds and I consider him well qualified for the position of a Supervisor which I hope he may some day obtain as I think from his long service and talents he is well deserving of a higher Salary than the one he now draws.

Pulicorin 3 (Signed) G. M. Payne Lt.
1st June 1860 3 Ag. District Engineer Tinnevelly.

Vyapuri Pillai served in the Office of the District Engineer Tinnevelly during the 20 months that I was present with it as Mr. Accts

and Estimate maker. I was thoroughly satisfied with him in all respects. His zeal and diligence were very great whilst his qualifications for the post he held were perfect. I do not think that I had occasion in one single instance to find fault with him. He thoroughly knows the District and is very ready to give information with an accuracy which has sometimes surprised me. I sincerely trust that he may get on well and tho his loss would be great here I should be glad if he filled some higher Office which he fully merits.

Sattoor 3 (Signed) G. V. Winscom Capt.
20 January 1862

O Vyapoori Pillai age when first entertained 22 years.

| Establishment | Date | Appointment | Salary | Period of Service in each appointment: Years | Months | Days | Remarks regarding punishments, Severe and formal reprimands and all Special commendations or marks of approbation. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | | 6 |
| P.W.D. | 186 | Clerk and Examiner | 70 | 1 | 3 | 2 | I cannot speak too highly of Vyapoory and I consider him one of the best Range Officers in my Division |
| Do | 3rd November 1864 | Head Accountant | 75 | - | - | 620 | |
| P.W.D. | 23rd May 1865 | Supervisor 2d class | 150 | - | - | - | |

(Signed) C. V. Wilkason. Lieut.

(True Copy)

Richd. Roberts Lieut. Col: R.E.
Superintending Engineer S. D.

Comp. Off

No 182 Superintg Engineers Office 8th Division
Madura 15 April 1872

From
Lieut. Colonel R. A. Roberts R.E.
Superintg Engineer 8th Division

To
Colonel G. Walker R.E.
Offg Secretary to Government
Fort St George

Sir
In reference to G.O. No 200 of the
22nd March 1872, No 200 I have
the honor to forward herewith a
letter No 26, dated the 8th Instant,
from the Acting Head Assistant
Magistrate of the Tinnevelly District,
furnishing the accompanying copy
of Register of preliminary enquiry
held before him in regard to the
alleged misconduct of Superviser
Tapalsorry Pillay.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your Most obdt Servant,
Lieut. Colonel
Superintg. Engineer 8th Division

Encl: Ord

Enclosure 2. In a
letter from the Superintg
Engineer 8th Division to the
Secretary to Government
dated 19th February 1872
No 4534.

P. W. 973/72.

Service Register.

No 2.8 Summary No. 1 Magistrate's Office
Vellanicum, 31st May 1872.

From
A. S. Saunders Esqre
Asst. Magistrate

To
Lieut. Colonel P. A. Roberts R. E.
Superintending Engineer 1st Div

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Summary of evidence in the case of Regina V. Vyapoory Pillay, No. 9 of 1871 on the file of this Court, which was forwarded to you for information on the 15th March last.

2nd I have now the honor to forward a copy of the Calendar in the said case which will explain the information you desire.

3rd I am reluctantly obliged to express opinion as to the guilt or innocence of the accused in which the evidence for the defence is considered sufficient to raise a doubt in my mind as to the guilt of the accused, and I may however state that the evidence of the two witnesses for the prosecution Sellappa Pillay & Kolandaivelu Pillay and Manickavasagam was taken

Facetiously

Rec'd Panelo 1/2 B. 20 Rs

P. W. 1872 Report
Rec'd 7th for the May 1872
Nos 1 to No. 1918.
The Supg Engineer
8 Dr

To
The Secretary to
Government D'W

Dated 15 April 1872
Received 18 "

Enclosures - 2
No 1355 - 31st May 72.
Forwards copies
of Summary evidence
in the case of
Vyapoory Pillay
Supervisor in charge
of the late 4th Range
Trincomalee required
in G O No 205 dated
22nd March 1872.

No 49.4

Rec'd 1st June 1872 - 2 Cys
6 2nd 1872

satisfactorily grown and that I saw no reason to disbelieve it.

I have the honor to be,

&c.

Your most obedt. Servt.

H. L. Brandel.

Ag. Asst. Magistrate.

Tinnevelly

From
The Asst. Magistrate
Tinnevelly
To The Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D.
Dated 31st May 1872.
No. 494.
Read 2 Letters
Dated 15th April 1872
Nos. 182 & 183
Relative to Cattle
Poisoning in the
Pillay-Oottoo Tank
Reg. No. 1918/72.
Reg. No. 1919/72.

Enclosure 1.
In a letter from
the Supt. Engineer
to the Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D. dated 15th April
1872 No. 182.

P. W. 1918/72

Head Assistant
Magistrate's letter.

From 31st May/72 L. B. No. 494

Read

Enclosure 2
In a letter from the
Sup.t Engineer 8.th Dn
to the Secretary to Govt
P. W. D dated 15.th April
1872 No. 182.

P.W. 1918/72.

Copy of evidence

Fm. Stilley 17 L. Bellagh.

Memorandum

For Orders.

I would recommend the result of the Hydraulic experiments of the two changes mentioned herein.

L. Ol.

In paragraph 5 of his letter No 1688 dated 15th August 1871 the Superintending Engineer of the 8th Division brought to notice the utterly untrustworthy character, and unfitness for the management of his Dewan, of Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay, and reported that

that the roads, tanks, and irrigation works generally in the 4th Range of the Tinnevelly District, of which the Supervisor held charge, had much deteriorated, and were falling into rapid decay; and that Government money was being diverted from its allotted Channels. Orders were accordingly issued for the submission of a special report in support of these allegations.

para 3 of G.O. dated 20th Sept.

In compliance with these instructions, the Superintending Engineer has instituted a lengthy and laborious enquiry into the misconduct of the Supervisor, and with his letter* now circulated he forwards the result for the consideration and orders of Government.

* No 4195 of 30th Sept 1872.

The specific charges, 27 in number – which have been preferred against the Supervisor, will be found succinctly stated in enclosure No 40 to the Superintending Engineer's letter, and comprise the levying

laying of a per-centage from Contractors on the amounts of Contracts, misappropriation of Government property and funds, falsification of accounts, neglect of duty, mismanagement of the affairs of the Range, and general dishonesty.

Syapoory Tillay's depositions are also submitted together with the reports of Mr Sub Engineer Mc Nair who conducted the Enquiry, under the orders of the Executive Engineer Mr Sage; and the remarks of the Superintending Engineer

× Encl: No 36.

* Encl No 51.

+ Encl: No 81.

containing seriatim remarks on the several accusations.

Lieutenant Colonel Roberts points out that owing to the irregular manner in which the depositions of witnesses were taken down by Mr Sage, much information of a damaging character to the Superviser which would otherwise have been elicited, had been suppressed, and he states that had Mr Mc Nair been left to conduct the investigation

Letter No 4195 of 30th Jany/72.

investigation independently of Mr Sage's arrangements and supervision the results would have been more satisfactory and would probably have been such as would ensure a magisterial conviction being obtained for the frauds in connection with the Buttresses to the latter Bridge and the Buildings at Vellaticolum. Lt Colonel Roberts expresses his entire dissent from the favorable view of the Supervisors case entertained by Mr Sage, and he forwards

Encls. Nos 76, 77 & 78.

forwards 3 petitions suggestive of the motives which actuated Mr Sage in forming his opinion.

Although the evidence elicited on the charges brought forward by the Superintending Engineer against Pillay Supervisor Vyapoory, is not so conclusive as it might apparently have been made, ~~there can be no doubt that Vyapoory Pillay's culpability is not a very great~~

× Charge No 2
* do " 8.

great degree had been established, and it seems undesirable to retain him in the Government Service.

It is a matter of regret that Mr Sub Engineer Mc Nair was not left to conduct the investigations entirely unfettered, or that the Executive Engineer, Mr Sage did not require all evidence taken down to be recorded in the form that is usual, which would have prevented any after denial or

on the part of witnesses.

The petitions against Mr Sage are unauthenticated, and it was therefore injudicious to bring them on the records of the Superintending Engineer's Office or to attach to them the significance which the Superintending Engineer has done by laying them before the Government.

Charges Nos 1 and 13 have been made the subject of a judicial enquiry by the Head Assistant

Assistant Magistrate of
Tinnevelly but with what
result is not known.

No. 1385. P.W.D.

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following

From

The Supt Engr 8th Div. (No. E. dy 4195 of 30th Janry 1872)

" do do " (" " dy 4332 of 5th July 1872)

" do do " (" " " 4534 of 19th " ")

" do do " (" " " 182 of 15th April 1872)

In paragraph 5 of his letter dy 1688 dated 15th August 1871 the Superintending Engineer of the 8th Division brought to notice the utterly untrustworthy character, and unfitness for the management of his Range, of Supervisor Vyapoory Pillay, and reported that the roads, tanks, and irrigation works generally in the 4th Range of

of the Tirinevelly District, of which the Supervisor held charge, had much deteriorated, and were falling into rapid decay; and that Government money was being diverted from its allotted channels. Orders were accordingly issued for the submission of a special report in support of these allegations.

para 3 of G.O. No. 2401 dated 20th Sept 1871.

In compliance with these instructions, the Supt Engineer has instituted a lengthy and laborious enquiry into the misconduct of the Supervisor, and with the first of his letters* above recorded he forwards the result for the consideration and

*No. 4195 of 30th June 1872.

orders of Government.

The specific charges, 27 in number, which have been preferred against the Supervisor, are succinctly stated in enclosure No. 40 to the Supt Engineer's letter, and comprise the levying of a per-centage from Contractors on the amounts of contracts, misappropriation of Government property and funds, falsification of accounts, neglect of duty, mismanagement of the affairs of the Range, and general dishonesty. Vyapoory Pillay's depositions are also submitted together with the report

*Encl. No. 36.

*Encl No. 51

of Inr. Sub-Engineer Mc Nair who conducted the enquiry under the orders of the Executive Engineer Mr. Sage: and the review of the Supt. Engineer containing seriatim remarks on the several accusations.

Encl No. 81

Lieutenant Colonel Roberts points out that owing to the irregular manner in which the depositions of witnesses were taken down by Mr. Sage, much information of a damaging character to the Supervisor which would otherwise have been elicited, has been suppressed, and he states that had

Letter No. 4195 of 30th Jany 1872.

Mr. Mc Nair been left to conduct the investigation independently of Mr. Sage's arrangements and supervision the result would have been more satisfactory and would probably have been such as would ensure a material conviction being obtained for the frauds in connection with the *Buttresses to the Sattur Bridge and the *Buildings at Vellaticolum. Lieutenant Colonel Roberts expresses his entire dissent from the favorable view of the Supervisors case entertained by

× charge No. 2
* do " 8.

bir Inr Sage, and he for-
-wards 3 petitions sug-
-gestive of the motives
which actuated Inr Sage
in forming his opinions.

Although the evidence
elicited on the charges
brought forward by
the Supt Engineer against
Supervisor Vyapoory
Pillay is not so con-
-clusive as it might
apparently have been
made, and the judicial
enquiry into Charges
Nos 1 and 13 did not
result in his committal
for trial for want of
sufficient evidence, the
Govt cannot but take
severe notice of his un-
-doubted irregularities

& Enclos Nos 76 77 878

and neglect, and resolve
that he shall be degra-
-ded to the bottom of the
list of Supervisors,
below Inr Supervisor
Crowe, and transferred
to do duty in the 7th
Division in charge
of the Cumdapoor &
Range of South Canara
which he will proceed
to join without delay.

It is a matter of
regret that Mr Supt
Engineer Mc Nair
was not left to conduct
the investigations en-
-tirely unfettered, or that
the Executive Engineer
Inr Sage did not require
all evidence taken
down to be recorded

in the form that is usual, which would have prevented any after denial on the part of witnesses.

The petitions against Int Sage are unauthenticated and it was therefore injudicious to bring them on the records of the Supt Engineers office or to attach to them the significance which the Supt Engineer has done by laying them before the Government.

Gen.

3 6/4

No. 13 The Supt Engr. 7. 88. Dec.
6 " Controller ✓

Decr. 1/6/72

Nos 651, 913, 1918, 1425
Govt. of 1872: Gladwin.

PUBLIC WORKS,

To The Superintending Engr
1st & 8th Division

Dated

Recd.

Encl. 76
2 Brokerage Bills

G. 31st May 1872, No. 1355.

Nos. 491 @ 495

Services of Syapaung Village
added to the Returns of the
Supervisors and
ferred to do duty in