

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	2214	Press
254F-25LG		Mis.
Dated	18-9	1872.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

119

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
18th September 1872.*

No. 254r. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Kocracolum, 16th August 1872, No. 2,325:—

In reference to G. O. of the 6th instant, No. 58, calling for an immediate report of the cause of delay in submitting the descriptive roll of the widow of a cooly who was accidentally killed while he was engaged in blasting rocks on the Kodacanel Ghaut Road, I have the honour to report as follows.

2. On the 20th June 1871 the widow of the deceased cooly addressed a petition to me stating that her husband had met with a fatal accident on the 27th December 1870 when he was blasting rocks; that she had addressed two or three petitions both to the Superintending Engineer (my predecessor) and to the Range Officer on the subject, but that she had received no redress; and that she and her children were suffering great distress, praying, therefore, that one of her children

may be employed on the road. This
* In my memorandum No. 1,495, dated 31st July 1871. petition was referred* to Overseer Serjeant Hamilton, then in charge of the

Dindigul Range, to see whether he could not arrange to employ, as proposed, one of the petitioner's sons in consideration of his father having died under the circumstances represented.

3. In reply Serjeant Hamilton informed me on the 11th August 1871† that the petitioner's son was only 1 year old and could not possibly be employed as petitioner requests; but that there would be no hindrance to petitioner being employed on the plains herself.

4. Serjeant Hamilton further stated that taking into consideration the circumstances under which the petitioner's husband had met with his death, and the destitute condition of petitioner and her child, it would not be too much to grant her a compassionate allowance of Rupees 50.

5. On the margin of the above letter I wrote an order on the 25th August 1871, No. 1,881, directing the Overseer in charge of the Range to prepare and forward Proceedings to investigate a claim to gratuity to the widow of the deceased cooly in the form printed at page 383 of Grant's Circular Order Book, and I returned the paper in original to the Range Office.

6. Not having received the Proceedings in question, Assistant-Engineer Mr. Lyon, who succeeded to the Dindigul Range, was requested by me on the 5th March 1872 to expedite the despatch of the document called for in memorandum No. 1,881, dated 25th August 1871, and he was at the same time requested to return the original letter from the Range Office, No. 150, dated 11th August 1871.

7. In reply Mr. Lyon applied‡ for a copy of memorandum just quoted as the original was not found in the Range Office.
‡ No. 490, dated 12th March 1872.

8. On the 19th March 1872§ I informed Mr. Lyon that this office memorandum No. 1,881, dated 25th August 1871, was written on the margin of Range Office letter No. 150, dated 11th August 1871, which latter has not been
§ No. 4,889.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
18th September 1872.

returned. He was requested to cause a careful search to be made in his office for the missing document and if not found to send a copy of Range Office letter above quoted.

9. Captain Pennycuik, R. E., who succeeded Mr. Lyon in the Dindigul Range, stated on the 26th April 1872, letter No. 47, that although a careful search has been made the missing document has not been found, and he forwarded a copy of the Range Office letter with an intimation that the Proceedings will be submitted so soon as received from the Periacolum Overseer, to whom instructions on the matter had been sent some time back.

10. Accordingly on the 31st May 1872* Captain Pennycuik forwarded the Proceedings to this office explaining that the delay in preparing them had arisen in consequence of the claimant (the widow of the deceased cooly) having left Periacolum and not having been found until lately.

11. As Captain Pennycuik had recommended a grant of Rupees 350 to the widow the Proceedings were returned by me to that officer on the 13th June 1872 pointing out to him that the gratuity admissible "shall in no case exceed the maximum limit of six months' pay of the deceased." Captain Pennycuik was at the same time requested to report whether an inquest was held or not on the body of the deceased workman.

12. The above Proceedings were corrected and returned by Captain Pennycuik on the 24th, received in this office on the 26th, and submitted to Government on the 29th June 1872 with my letter No. 1,441.

13. I may mention, in conclusion, that no report of the accident was made to this office by the then Range Officer, Assistant-Engineer Mr. O. A. Hayne, and that the fact only came to my knowledge on receipt of the petition above alluded to.

No. 254G. ORDER THEREON, 18th September 1872, No. 2,214.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 19.

HIS EXCELLENCY the Governor in Council is compelled to express his dissatisfaction at the great delay which was allowed to occur in the disposal of the claim to gratuity preferred by the petitioner alluded to in Superintending Engineer's letter No. 2,325 dated 16th August 1872.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.

Suprintg. Engineer's Office S.D.
Kodacolum 16 August 1872

No. 2325.

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

To
Colonel G. W. Walker R.E.
Secretary to Government S.D.W.

Ref.
In reference to G.O. of the 6th instmt, No 58, calling for an immediate report of the cause of delay in submitting the descriptive roll of the widow of a cooly who has accidentally killed while he was engaged in blasting rocks on the Kodacanal ghāt road, I have the honor to report as follows:-

2. On the 20th June 1871, the widow of the deceased cooly addressed a petition to me stating that her husband had met with a fatal accident on

the 27 December 1870, when he was
blasting rock, that she had addressed
two or three petitions both to the Su-
perintending Engineer (my predecessor)
and to the Range Officer on the subject,
but that she had received no redress,
and that she and her children were
suffering great distress - praying therefore
that one of her children may be em-
ployed on the road. This petition was
referred to Overseer Serjeant Hamilton
then in charge of the Dindigul Range,
to see whether he could not arrange
to employ, as proposed, one of the
petitioners' sons, in consideration of his
father having died under the circumstances
represented.

in my memo.
No 1495 dated
31st July 1871.

3. In reply Serjeant Hamilton
informed me on the 11 August 1871, ^{letter No 150}
that the petitioner's son was only one
year old, and could not possibly
be employed as petitioner requests, but

that there would be no hindrance to
petitioner being employed on the plains
herself.

4. Serjeant Hamilton further stated
that taking into consideration the
circumstances under which the petitioner's
husband had met with his death,
and the destitute condition of petitioner
and her child, it would not be too
much to grant her a compassionate
allowance of Rupees 50..

5. On the margin of the above
letter, I wrote an order on the 25 August
1871, No 1881, directing the Overseer in
charge of the Range, to prepare and
forward Proceedings to investigate
a claim to gratuity to the widow
of the deceased cooly, in the form
printed at page 383 of Grant's Circular
Order book, and I returned the paper
in original to the Range Office.
6. Not having received the Proceeding

in question, Assistant Engineer Mr. Lyon who succeeded to the Dandigul Range, was requested by me on the 5th March 1872, to expedite the despatch of the document called for in Memo No 1881, dated 25 August 1871, and he was at the same time requested to return the original letter from the Range Office, No 150, dated 11 August 1871.

7. In reply, Mr Lyon applied ^{No 490 dated} 12th March 1872 for a copy of Memo just quoted as the original was not found in the Range Office.

8. On the 19th March 1872, I ^{No 4889} informed Mr Lyon that this Office Memo No 1881, dated 25 August 1871 was written on the margin of Range Office letter, No 150, dated 11 August 1871, which latter has not been returned. He was requested to cause a careful search to be made in his Office for the missing document, and if not

found, to send a copy of Range Office letter above quoted.

9. Captain Pennycook & Co who succeeded Mr Lyon in the Dandigul Range, stated on the 26 April 1872, letter No 47, that although a careful search has been made, the missing document has not been found, and he forwarded a copy of the Range Office letter, with an intimation that the Proceedings will be submitted so soon as received from the Periacolum Overseer to whom instructions on the matter had been sent some time back.

10. Accordingly on the 31st May 1872, Captain Pennycook forwarded the Proceedings to this Office explaining that the delay in preparing them had arisen in consequence of the claimant (the widow of the deceased cooly) having left Periacolum and not having been found until lately.

11. As Captain Pennycook had recommended a grant of \$350 to the widow, the Proceedings were returned by me to that Officer on the 13th June 1872, pointing out to him that the gratuity admissible shall in no case exceed the maximum limit of 6 months pay of the deceased. Captain Pennycook was at the same time requested to report whether an inquest was held or not on the body of the deceased workman.

12. The above Proceedings were corrected and returned by Captain Pennycook on the 21st, received in this Office on the 26th and submitted to Government on the 29th June 1872, with my letter No 1441.

15. I may mention, in conclusion, that no report of the accident was made to this Office by the then Range Officer Assistant Engineer

Mr O. A. Stayne, and that the fact only came to my knowledge on receipt of the petition above alluded to.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servant,

Richard Roberts - Lieut. Col. R.E.
Superintg. Engineer & Dr.

Public Works Department
 No 22/4
 Proceedings of the Madras Government
 Read the following

From The Sup^r Engr^s } H.E. No 2325 of 16th Aug 1872
 8th Jan

His Excellency
 the Governor in Council
 is compelled to ex-
 press his dissatis-
 faction at the great
 delay which was
 allowed to occur in
 the disposal of the
 claim to gratuity
 preferred by the Peti-
 tioner alluded to in
 Superintending Engr^s

letter No 2325 dated
 16th August 1872

24
 2
 The Sup^r Engr^s 8th Jan
 Dec 15/4/72

Recd 1872 Madras
 1872 Madras

The Sup^r Engr^s
 Secy to Govt
 Madras

Date 16th Dec 1872

Explains delay in
 submitting the claim
 of a workman who was
 accidentally killed on
 the Madras Road
 Madras 8th

No 22/4 - 1872

Recd 1872 Madras

Colonel Robert
does not report what
the Petitioners said
to have been forwarded
prior to January 18
ever reached or can
now be found in
the Range or Super-
intending Engrs Office

A period ex-
ceeding a month
seems to have elapsed
between the receipt of
forwarding of the petition
dated 20th June 1877
This is an unfortunate
and the omission to

Cp 4072

Govt. of 1872 Madras
PUBLIC WORKS.

To
The Superintending Engineer
8th Division

Dated

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 18th Sept^r, No. 2214.

Nos. 254 F. 254 G.

patently... Expressing
dissatisfaction at the
great delay which was
allowed to occur in the
disposal of the claim
to patently prepared
by the widow of the
coolie who was acci-
dentally killed on the
Kodacanall Road,
Madras.