

(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.  | 2240  | Press |
| 295, 296, |       | Mis.  |
| Dated     | 21-9- | 1872. |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,  
21st September 1872.*

No. 295. Read the following letter from the Officiating Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Camp at Manapalli, 16th August 1872, No. 1,070:—

With reference to your memorandum, No. 167, forwarding correspondence particularized in a list accompanying which correspondence is herewith returned, I cannot do better than forward a copy of a letter\* from Mr. O'Ratigan, whom I called on for any explanation he might have to offer.

\* No. 296, dated 6th August 1872.

2. The records of the Cuddapah Pinge Office have been searched without success for any written explanation given by late Overseer Seshachellum Naidoo, and, indeed, as will be seen from Mr. O'Ratigan's explanation, such is not likely to be forthcoming, as the Overseer's explanation was given to him verbally.

3. That the Overseer committed a serious irregularity in the matter of the cheque there can be no doubt, but nothing more so far as I can see: there was no possible pecuniary gain or advantage accruing to him from his course of action; his own statement is that he considered a cheque as equivalent to cash, and his great object seems to have been not to show a large unexpended balance at the close of the month. As regards Mr. O'Ratigan, he also merely regarded the transaction as irregular, and utterly unconnected with any fraudulent attempt; he called on the Overseer for an explanation, which, as before said, was given verbally, and he recorded a remark on the Overseer's cash account vouching for his disapproval of the transaction.

4. The matter of the foregoing cheque is all on which I am called for information, but I would bring to the notice of Government that the charge on which the Overseer was dismissed was thrown out by the Assistant Magistrate, who remarked most severely on the conduct of the department in bringing against an old servant of Government, who possessed high testimonials, a charge based on so small and utterly untrustworthy evidence.

5. The opinion entertained of the late Overseer will be gathered from Mr. O'Ratigan's letter, and I am informed that the then Collector, Mr. vansAgnew, was so struck by the good condition of the works in the Royachoty Taluq, that he voluntarily gave the Overseer the testimonial referred to.

6. Mr. O'Ratigan fully confirms the favorable opinion entertained by Mr. vansAgnew (who in Department Public Works matters is hard to please); he says the roads, buildings, and works in the Royachoty Taluq were always kept in splendid order, and that the Overseer not only always spent his own allotment, but was also able to spend sums in addition, which could not be spent in other taluqs.

7. On the whole, it seems to me difficult to come to any conclusion other than that the late Overseer has been very harshly dealt with.

No. 296. ORDER THEREON, 21st September 1872, No. 2,240.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 21.

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that, looking to the decision of the Magistrate, the testimonials as to previous conduct and the opinion expressed by both the Superin-

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,  
21st September 1872.

tending Engineer and the Range Officer  
Overseer Seshachellum Naidoo, the grav  
subordinate was clearly guilty will have  
period of suspension during which he  
employment. His Excellency accordingly  
Department of Public Works, and that

(True)

as to the general efficiency of Taluq  
partmental irregularities of which that  
en. sufficiently met by the prolonged  
been debarred from Government  
directs his re-appointment to the  
transferred from the 3rd Division.

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Officiating Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division.  
,, Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Office of the Controller of  
Public Works Accounts  
Fort St. George, June 1872.  
The Officiating Controller of  
Public Works Accounts,  
Fort St. George.  
The Secretary to Government,  
Public Works Department,  
Fort St. George.

Enclosure

I have the honor to acknow-  
ledge the receipt of the Memorandum  
from the Under Secretary to Government,  
Public Works Department, No. 187, dated  
26th June 1872, and in reply to state  
that the Cash Accounts of Taluq  
Overseers are not furnished with the  
Range Accounts forwarded monthly  
to this office for audit, being required

only by the Range officer for the preparation of his accounts. This office therefore was not aware of the remark made by Mr O'Ratigan in the Oversee's Cash Account forwarded with the above Memo: nor do I find any note on the subject, or allusion to it, in the Vouchers of the Buddapah Range for 1870-71. The Cash Balance Statement of the Range on the 1st October 1870 exhibits the sum of Rupees 7-1-1 as in the hands of Oversee Sachachellum. In the Royachode Treasury Certificate of Balance dated 24th September 1870, cheque No. 108, for Rupees 1000, (the identical one referred to by Mr O'Ratigan) is shown as one of the "cheques unpaid", without however any remark against it, and in the Cash Account Current for September of that year, the Range

Officer makes the following note in the printed Form of Memo: provided in the reverse side of that document.

"Did not examine \*\*\*\* the Royachode Oversee's Accounts, as there was no opportunity."

2. The Enclosures received with the Memo: under reply are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be Sir,

Your most obedient Servant.

J. H. Seal Captain R.E.,  
Offg. Controller of N.W. Accounts.

No. 1070

Superintending Engineer's Office.

### 3rd Division.

Cann  
Bellary Madanapalle

16<sup>th</sup> August 1872.

*From,*

*The Superintending Engineer*

### 3rd Division.

*To,*

*Thé.*

Secretary to Government  
Public Works Department

Public Works Department.

Fort St. George

Sir,

With reference to your Memorandum  
No 167 forwarding Correspondence particu-  
larized in a list accompanying which Cor-  
respondence is herewith returned, I cannot  
do better than forward a Copy of letter from  
Mr. O'Riagan, whom I called on for any  
explanation he might have to offer.

2. The Records of the Cuddalore Range Office have been searched without success for any written explanation given by late Oversee Seshachellum Naidoo, and indeed as will be seen from Mr. Phategan's explanation, such is not likely to be forthcoming, as the Oversee's explanation was given to him verbally.

3. That the Overseer committed a serious irregularity in the matter of the Cheque. There can be no doubt, but nothing more, so far as I can see; there was

*Enclosures.*

\* Ms 296 Df. 6 August  
1872.

26 June 1893

J. M. 1872. Richard.

4  
Mar 21 1891  
A-3174.

The Off. Controller

Wm. Hunt  
of the Secretary's

Disengagement  
Disengagement.

293-1

[illegible]

Richardson

states that we were  
accounted for and finally

to this office cannot  
be made without the

Account received in the  
Office of Landry to the  
18th Dec. 1865.

Overold's Irish Account  
for September 1841

For experience —

no possible pecuniary gain or advantage  
accruing to him from his <sup>Course of action,</sup>  
his own statement is that, <sup>he considered a</sup>  
Cheque as equivalent to Cash <sup>and his great</sup>  
object seems to have been not <sup>to show a large</sup>  
unexpended Balance at the <sup>close of the subalte.</sup>  
As regards Mr. O'Hatigan - <sup>he also merely</sup>  
regarded the transaction as <sup>irregular, and</sup>  
utterly unconnected with any <sup>fraudulent</sup>  
attempt; he called on the <sup>Overseer for an</sup>  
explanation, which, as before <sup>said, was given</sup>  
verbally, and he recorded a <sup>Remark on the</sup>  
Overseer's Cash Account, <sup>vouching for his</sup>  
disapproval of the transaction.

4. The matter of the foregoing <sup>Cheque is all</sup>  
on which I am called for <sup>information, but</sup>  
seems, being to the notice of <sup>Government</sup>  
that the Charge, on which <sup>the Overseer was</sup>  
dismissed was thrown out by <sup>the Assistant</sup>  
Magistrate, who remarked <sup>most severely</sup>  
on the Conduct of the Department in  
bringing against an old <sup>servant of Govt.</sup>  
who possessed high testimonials, a charge  
based on so small, and utterly <sup>untrustworthy</sup>  
evidence.

5. The opinion entertained of the late Over-  
seer will be gathered from Mr. O'Hatigan's  
letter, and I am informed that the then  
Collector, Mr. Vans Agnew, was so struck  
by the good condition of the works in the  
Rojachoty Talook, that he voluntarily  
gave the Overseer the testimonial referred  
to.

6. Mr. O'Hatigan fully confirms the

favourable opinion entertained by Mr. Vans &  
Agnew (who in D. P. M. matters is hard  
to please); he says the Roads, Buildings and  
works in the Rojachoty Talook were always  
kept in splendid order, and that the Overseer  
not only always spent his own allotment,  
but was also able to spend sums in addi-  
tion, which could not be spent in other Talooks.  
7. On the whole, it seems to me difficult  
to come to any conclusion other than that  
the late Overseer has been very harshly  
dealt with.

I have dear  
Carristville Capt. R.  
Offy. Supag. Aug. 30/80

Copy of Letter No. 296 Df. 6<sup>th</sup> August 1872 from the two  
Engineers in charge Madanapalli Range, to the  
Superintending Engineer P.D.

Referring to your endorsement on the Me-  
morandum noted on the Margin, I have the honour to  
state that no steps that I remember have been  
taken in the matter of Cheque referred to, save, to  
inform the late Overseer that the proceeding was  
quite irregular and should not occur again. The  
Cheque appears in the Range Books and in the  
Treasury Officer's Certificate as an undrawn one,  
the amount is however shown as expended in the  
Account Current & Progress Report.

II. The Officer in charge of Kuddapah Range to  
whom I have applied for a copy of the Overseer's ex-  
planation, and whose reply has this day been  
received, informs me, that he is unable to find  
the same in his Office; so if a written one has been  
furnished it has been mislaid. I beg however to  
state that I remember distinctly the Overseer attend-  
ing my Office to explain matters. His explanation  
was to the effect that he received the Cheque on the  
24<sup>th</sup> of the month when the Treasury had been closed  
and that he borrowed the money to pay the Coolies  
to secure their services, as they were clamouring for  
pay, not having been paid for three months owing to  
him (the late Overseer) having been engaged with  
me in examining work in the Taluk. He also  
gave as a reason that he did not wish to keep so large  
a Cash balance as Rs 1000 in hand at the end of  
the month, the same being contrary to the Order

of

Received July 1872

To  
The Deputy Commr  
From P.D. 1872  
No. 4080.

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division.

To  
The Deputy Commr

From P.D. 1872  
No. 4080.

No. 1872

Dated 1872  
Received 25

Sen. 50.

Deposited to P.D.

Memorandum of P.D.

19 July 1872

to the Superintending Engineer

Commenced by P.D.

Received P.D.

Received P.D.

Received P.D.

Received P.D.

Received P.D.

of Government & that being of opinion, that the cheque was the same as Cash, he considered that he could act as he did.

3. On receiving the above mentioned explanation from the late Overseer, and taking into account that the cheque had then been already cashed, I considered that I could not mind matters & thinking that the Controller, would refer to the case if he considered that the accounts required alteration, I allowed things to rest as I found them - The late Overseer was however then informed that cheques were not negotiable and that private funds could not be substituted for the same - as however the transaction could not possibly be of any benefit to him, and could not cause any loss to Government, I considered, as stated above, that it was not necessary to take any further action in the matter.

4. I may mention that up to the date of the occurrence referred to, the late Overseer bore a splendid character & that his works & accounts were always found correct and well done, more especially his roads - Colonel Moberly & Mr. Vansagim also thought highly of him, and told me that they were well pleased with everything they saw in his Talook - I beg also to state that I only left Royachoty Talook about a month previous to the occurrence referred to, having been engaged for more than 2 months in the Talook, during which period, I examined every bit of work in it without having received a complaint from any one about the Overseer, nor could I see any thing to find fault with myself - This was not

the case with any of the other 4 Talooks then in my charge as the records of your Office will show

Supg. Engr. Office 3<sup>rd</sup> Bn  
Camp Madanapalle  
16<sup>th</sup> August 1872 }  
Lemon Tree Capt. R.E.  
Offg. Supg. Engineer  
3<sup>rd</sup> Bn

Works Deptt  
2240  
Proceedings of the Madras Govt

Read the following

From the Supy Engr  
of the 3<sup>d</sup> Division

(H. Sect. 1070 d/16 Augt/14)

A. A.  
J. L.

This Excellency  
the Governor in Council  
is of opinion, that,  
looking to the decision  
of the Magistrate, the  
testimonials as to pre-  
vious conduct and  
the opinion expressed  
by both the Superintend-  
ing Engineer and the  
Range Officer as  
to the general efficiency  
of Taluk Officer  
Sasachillam Naidoo,

P. No. 4080/2.  
Enclosure to letter  
1070 d/16 Augt/14  
The Supy Engr  
of the 3<sup>d</sup> Division  
Government of M. P. D.

the grave departmental  
irregularities of which  
that subordinate was  
clearly guilty will  
have been sufficiently  
met by the prolonged  
period of suspension  
during which he has  
been debarred from  
Government employ-  
ment - His Ex-  
cellency accordingly  
directs his reappoint-  
ment to the Depart-  
ment of Public Works,  
in the lowest grade,

I would put him  
back where he was  
and in rank of Grade 1  
that is the lowest

17  
and that he be  
transferred from the  
3rd Division -

G.M.W. C.S.

30  
3

S. Engr 3rd Div ✓  
Controller - /  
Dec 27/92

27/2/82  
Obt. of 1872 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Officiating Superintendent  
Eng. S. P. Brown

Encl. 50

G. O. 21 Sept 72, No. 2240.

Nos. 295 & 296

g Overseer Sasachellum  
Ido - Re appointing

Sasachellum Kaidas  
to the P. M. Dept and di-  
recting his transfer  
from the 3rd.