M.R.O. 1—77,006—8-6-37.

(1) Number of pages 176

(2) Date of repair 31. 10. 44

(3) Initials of the Referencer

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 3040 Press
478-479. ~~Mis.~~

Dated 20. 12. 1872.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 20th December 1872.

Read the following papers :—

No. 478. From the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madura, 11th October 1872, No. 3,201.

In reference to the Chief Engineer's Memorandum, No. 210, dated the 25th July 1872, calling upon me for further explanation in connection with the dismissal of the late Acting Taluq Overseer P. Peroomal Naidoo, I have the honour to state as follows.

Two original letters.

I may premise by saying that as Peroomal Naidoo was permitted by Government to act as Taluq Overseer upon my special recommendation, I should naturally be the last person to ask for his removal from the department, except in what I considered to be very urgent grounds for the same.

2. I have already, in my letter No. 755, dated 18th May 1872, pointed out that it is not in consequence of the late Overseer's inefficiency or incompetency that I have dismissed him from the service, but on account of his moral obliquity of vision and unsatisfactory conduct in his having not only wilfully falsified an official document, and persistently uttered many falsehoods in connection therewith, but also for his having attempted to involve into the case several members of this department, who are in no way concerned in the matter, and for his having even gone so far as to try to induce the Head Accountant of the Madura Range Office to give false testimony on his behalf, with a view to screen himself from punishment and to bring Overseer Moothoosawmy Pillay into difficulties.

3. I now enclose the correspondence noted in the margin, received from the Assistant Engineer, Madura Range, furnishing the information required in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of the above memorandum.

Letter No. 393, dated 7th August 1872.
" " 555, " 3rd October "

4. Should the Government consider that the Naidoo has been too severely dealt with by my having recovered* from him the sum of Rupees 107-11-4 to meet a portion of the excess expenditure incurred by him without authority on the Police barracks, I request the favour of the early orders of Government as to the amount to be repaid to the Naidoo from that already recovered from him, in order to enable me to apply to the Police Department for an allotment of funds to cover the outlay in question. The total excess outlay incurred by Peroomal Naidoo is Rupees 139 as already reported by me, while the work is unfortunately so ill-executed that the building is reported to me to leak as badly as it did before it was repaired. The execution of this work required no particular technical attainments, but mere ordinary care and integrity on the part of the Overseer.

* Reported to Controller, *vide* G. O., No. 43, 3rd July 1872, on the Statement of Objectionable Items for March 1872.

5. I may mention, in conclusion, that my own experience of this division has convinced me that the natives of this part of the country are in the habit of making scandalous imputations on Government officers when they find that those

officers are exercising their best endeavours to see that the interests of Government are not infringed in the transaction of public business; and as the statement in defence submitted to Government by Peroomal Naidoo did not accompany the Chief Engineer's memorandum under reply, I shall deem it a favour if the same be transmitted to me for my perusal and eventual return.

No. 478A. Endorsement of the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, dated on circuit at Kokracolum, 19th November 1872, No. 3,895.

From the Assistant Engineer in charge of Madura, to the Superintending Engineer, 8th Division, dated Madura, 1st November 1872, No. 653.

2 Petitions from Peroomal Naidoo to Government.
1 Memorandum from Government.
1 Extract from the Administration Report of Madura Range.
1 Statement from Gopal Iyer.
* Herewith returned.

In reference to your memorandum No. 3,404, dated 26th October 1872, submitting memorandum from Government, No. 166, dated 21st idem, forwarding Peroomal Naidoo's petition* for consideration and opinion, and requesting me for such further remarks I may wish to offer on the several points mentioned in the petition, I have the honour to submit the following notes on the various points which I have numbered in red ink on Peroomal Naidoo's petition :—

No. 1.—The statement that I continued to report unfavourably of him is false—see my remarks in Administration Report for 1871-72, dated so late as April 1872, herewith attached. (Peroomal Naidoo was dismissed in May following!)

No. 2.—As has been remarked in red pencil, this is perfectly false; Moothoosawmy Pillay never assured me that he had been satisfied as to the cause of excess of expenditure and the sufficiency of the unspent balance of the estimate to complete the work. As I said in my letter to Superintending Engineer, dated 7th August 1872, No. 393, and what he did tell me "before the Naidoo was that if he (the Naidoo) would send him a Contractor to complete the work for the balance remaining, it would be well, or otherwise he could not undertake it; this Peroomal Naidoo agreed to do."

No. 3.—Overseer Valoyadum Pillay entered into contract with an individual to repair the barracks; immediately afterwards he left Madura for Shevagunga, and by order of Superintending Engineer, I put Soobroyaloo Naidoo in charge. I was at the time the work was commenced on circuit. Soobroyaloo Naidoo found the Contractor's work bad, and reported the same to the Superintending Engineer personally, who ordered the work to be stopped, and this was done. The cost of the actual amount of work done by the Contractor was not more than 40 or 50 Rupees; this having been condemned, was not paid for. Not more than a couple of squares of tile-work was put up and the wastage was very little, and a rupee's worth of new tiles would over and above replace in cost those broken by removal; even this was at the loss to the Contractor, *not having been paid for.*

No. 4.—The Head Accountant's statement is herewith attached as requested, which is a further instance of Peroomal Naidoo's untruthfulness, for what he, the Accountant, states actually took place at the examination before the Superintending Engineer and myself.

No. 5.—As I have already stated, Moothoosawmy Pillay told me he would undertake to complete the work on condition Peroomal Naidoo would give him Contractors. I was at Coonathoor at the time I got the Pillay's letter, stating that the Naidoo had failed to send the men as promised, and, under these circumstances, reporting that the balance remaining was not sufficient to complete the work. Peroomal Naidoo was with me on circuit at the time, and assured me he would send the Contractors at once. I made the following endorsement on the back of the Pillay's letter :—" you told me that the work can be completed within the estimate, so you must do your best to do so. I won't go up again for more money." By this, of course, I meant that the arrangements for completing the work as agreed by the Overseers should be carried out.

The explanatory report (underlined in blue in petition) was sent in by Peroomal Naidoo *some time after* he had drawn up the comparative statement on which the foot note was made *at Tiroomungalum* and *after* the Pillay had signed the statement—see letter No. 10, dated 25th April 1872, from Moothoosawmy Pillay.

No. 6.—Already explained in No. 5.

No. 7.—I am (and always have been) satisfied that had Peroomal Naidoo carrid out the repairs to the barracks with ordinary care, the estimate was *quite sufficient.* I examined the work several times before Peroomal Naidoo delivered over charge to Moothoosawmy Pillay, and as I have already stated in my letter, No. 555, dated 5th instant, constantly remonstrated with the Naidoo for executing the work in the manner he was doing; but he always assured me savings were being effected in various items, and that the estimate would not be exceeded. The work done while Soobroyaloo Naidoo had the supervision of the repairs to the building was never paid for, so that the number of times it was taken down should not be taken into consideration.

No. 8.—Already explained in former report.

No. 9.—Already several times proved to be false. Petitioner did promise to send his own Contractor, but failed.

No. 10.—The lascar in question was dismissed on the 9th May (for continually absenting himself from duty), the inquiry took place on the 14th, and here is another false statement of Peroomal Naidoo.

No. 11.—The Tiroomungalum Taluq Overseer's Writer is in no way connected or related to the Head Accountant of my Office; here is another falsehood.

No. 12.—No evidence was taken down in writing by me, simply the statements of the writers were sent up to the Superintending Engineer in their own hand-writing. The only witnesses brought forward by Peroomal Naidoo were the lascar already referred to, whom, after dismissal, was employed as his brother's bandy-driver, and two outsiders, and what these people had to say was word for word what Peroomal Naidoo deposed.

As I have already reported, when the Naidoo was asked for his witnesses, he gave only the name of Writer Venkatachellum Iyengar, whereas at the inquiry he managed to produce three others, whose statements are worth as much as his own.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department, 20th December 1872.

FORWARDED for the final orders of Government, with reference to the Chief Engineer's memorandum No. 210, dated 25th July 1872.

1 Letter from Madura Range Officer, No. 114, 24th May 1872.
1 Comparative Statement.
1 Letter from Overseer Moothoosawmy Pillay, No. 10, 25th April 1872, with five Enclosures.
2 Letters from Peroomal Naidoo, Nos. 238 and 13, 1st March and 16th April 1872.
1 Evidence of Vencatachellum Iyengar.
1 Do. of Narrainsawmy Iyer.
2 Petitions from Peroomal Naidoo, dated 3rd July 1872.
1 Extract from Administration Report.
1 Statement of Gopal Iyer.

2. The enclosures called for in the Under Secretary's memorandum, No. 166, dated 21st October 1872, are herewith forwarded.

3. The undersigned has little to add to what he has already written on this unpleasant subject. The post of Taluq Overseer is essentially one of trust, and the Government have a right to claim ordinary honesty of purpose from every individual appointed to that post, otherwise nothing but confusion can be expected as the result.

4. Peroomal Naidoo is lamentably deficient in this respect. He was dismissed by the undersigned not on account of his want of technical experience as Overseer, as time would have remedied this, but on account of his slippery ways and want of trustworthiness—defects of character too ingrained unfortunately to hold out a hope of ever being eradicated.

(Signed) R. A. ROBERTS, Lieut.-Colonel, R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, 8th Division.

No. 479, ORDER THEREON, 20th December 1872, No. 3,040.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 37.

HIS EXCELLENCY the Governor in Council would not feel justified in over ruling the decision of the Superintending Engineer in Peroomal Naidoo's case, that Officer having after due consideration reiterated his opinion that the petitioner is quite unfit for the post of Taluq Overseer, and so untrustworthy as not to be deserving of re-employment in any lower capacity.

(True Extract.)
(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Madura.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

No. 555 Mandera Range Office

From Mandera 3rd Oct. 1872

The Asst. Engineer

Mandera Range

To

The Supt. Engineer

8th Div.

Sir

In reference to the further information requested by you on Chief Engineer's Memo No. 210 dated 25th July 1872 on the subject of late Taluq Overseer Personal Violence & do's dismissal & Para 5 I have the honor to inform you that whilst the Police Barracks at Mandera were under repair I constantly inspected it & remonstrated with Personal Standoo on executing the work in the manner he was doing paying up

[illegible] Range Office

From [illegible] 1872

The [illegible]

To

The [illegible]

Sir

In reference to the further information requested by you on Chief Engineer's Memo No. 210 dated 25th July 1872 on the subject of late Taluq Overseer Personal Violence & do's dismissal & Para 5 I have the honor to inform you that whilst the Police Barracks at Mandera were under repair I constantly inspected it & remonstrated with Personal Standoo on executing the work in the manner he was doing paying up

[illegible] Range Office

From [illegible] 1872

The [illegible]

To

The [illegible]

Sir

In reference to the further information requested by you on Chief Engineer's Memo No. 210 dated 25th July 1872 on the subject of late Taluq Overseer Personal Violence & do's dismissal & Para 5 I have the honor to inform you that whilst the Police Barracks at Mandera were under repair I constantly inspected it & remonstrated with Personal Standoo on executing the work in the manner he was doing paying up

paying no attention to the rates allowed in the Estimate for the various description of work, he always assured me that he was effecting saving in one item or another & that the Estimate would not be exceeded: of course I was obliged to believe him but as has already been shown he misled me & it was his duty when he exceeded the Estimate which occurred when I was on a tour through the Sub Division to bring it to my notice which he failed to do.

I have &c.

Asst. Engr.

In charge of Shoeburyness Range.

No. 555 3446

From The Assistant Engineer
Incl. of Madura Range

To The Superintending Engr
S. P. Dist

Dated 3rd
Received 5th October 1872

Informs on the subject of late
Mr. Paling Overseer Peroamal
Naidoo having exceeded the Estimate of the Police Barracks
works at Madura

7

Enclosure 2. in a letter from the Superintending Engineer 8. Div. No. 3201 dated 11th October 1872

To The Secretary to Govt

of W.

P.W. 3014/72.

Letter No. 555 dated 3d October 1872 from the Assistant Engr. Madura Range regarding the late A. Talwk Observer P. Perumal Naicken.

No 393

Asst. Engineers Office
Camp. Chuckoody 7th August 1872

From

The Asst. Engineer
In Ch of Madura Range

To

The Superintending Engr.
8th Division

Enclos 8
1 Original P.C. No 210 dated 29th July with 7 Enclosures.

Sir,

In reference to your Memo No. 2051, dated 29th ultimo on Chief Engineer's No. 210 on the Subject of late Asst. Talwk Observer Perumal Naidoo's dismissal.

I have the honor to report that there can be no doubt that the foot note in the Statement was inserted by the Naidoo with intent to deceive, in as much that it was not put in till after he had given over Charge of the works to Moothoosawmy Pillay & after the document was sent to him thrice for Signature and

at

at the time when there was a difference between himself & the Pillay regarding the balance remaining for completing the Police Barracks.

Permaul Naidoo's Statement that Moothoosawmy Pillay assured me that the Estimate would suffice to complete the work is perfectly untrue. What he did tell me before the Naidoo was, that if he (the Naidoo) would send him a Contractor to Complete the work for the balance remaining, it would be well, for otherwise he could not undertake it, this Permaul Naidoo agreed to do, but when the Comparative Statement was sent to him to sign he inserts the foot note in question, and when called upon by Moothoosawmy Pillay for the Contractor he promised to send him to Carry out the work, he turns round & tells him he will have nothing to do with it & that the Pillay must get a man to do the work the best way he can.

Permaul Naidoo Exceeded the rates for various items of work allowed in the Estimate without reference to me as will be seen from the Comparative Statement and it was impossible to expect that work still required as per Estimate to be executed to the Barracks to the Value of Rs 520, could be done for Rs 351 the balance remaining on Permaul Naidoo's handing over charge of it to Moothoosawmy Pillay.

As regards Mismanagement on the part of Permaul Naidoo the Comparative Statement shows this clearly, for it is owing to this that the rates for various description of works have exceeded those allowed in the Estimate Vide items marked a. B. C. in red ink.

As regards Permaul Naidoo untrustworthyness the following facts

speak for themselves.

1st In a bill he gave the Contractor of the Kurullipoothoor road in the Veroomungalum Taluq for work done he included the value of filling in sides or dressing of the road, & on my Examination of the work I found that this item had not been carried out.

2nd The Closing of breaches in the Athecaree patty Canal. Colum Saiks. Permaul Naidoo Entrusted to a Contractor by name Nina Mahomed Lois, the Value of the actual work Executed by this man was Rs 68-6-; whereas Permaul Naidoo gave him a bill for Rs 103 having included the cost of work done by the Villagers at the time the bank was breached. The balance ought to have been paid to the Villagers which in consequence of its not having been done they now demand payment

3rd Earth work to the Extent of 283/27 Cyds. Permaul Naidoo gave a bill for work said to have been Executed to the Kulloputty Tank & in his Measurement book made a Remark that the Pits from which the Earth was excavated had filled up. whereas from the time the work was Commenced to the time of its completion no rain had fallen in this locality or even in the whole Taluq or was there even water in the Tank so that he charged for more work than was actually done.

Several other works in the Veroomungalum Taluq Carried out by Permaul Naidoo I found on Inspection to have been most Carelessly Executed.

You will recollect also in the case of the construction of the Police Hospital bathroom. Permaul Naidoo exceeded the Estimate of Rs. 150 by Rs. 27 without any reference to me. Vide your Memo No 3637 dated 20th December/71

I have &c.

Ed. Rungert Asst Engr.
In ch of Madura Range

Radditi folio :- 1

12

Expo. 393

From
The Asste. Engineer
Dwch of Maduro Paugo

To The Supg. Engineer
8th Division

Date 7th } August 92
Recd

Encls 8

Furnishes certain information regarding the points noticed by Govt. in Connection with late Ag. Overseer Permaul's Wards Case.

Encls. 1. in a letter from the Superintt. Engineer 8. Divn. in No. 3201. dated 11. Oct. 1872.

To The Secretary to Govt. of Mr.

P. W. 5014/72.

Letter No. 393 dated 7. August /72. from the Assistant Engr. Madura Range regarding the late Act. Talook Overseer P. Perumal Naicken

No 1

Read to follow:— 7D 1

Superintt. Engineer's Office 8th Divn.

No. 3201. Madura 11th October 1872.

From, 13.

Lieut. Colonel R. A. Roberts R.E.

Superintt. Engineer 8th Divn.

To

Colonel G. W. Walker R.E.

Secretary to Government of M.P.D.

Sir,

In reference to the Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 210 dated the 25th July 1872, calling upon me for further explanation in connection with the dismissal of the late Acting Talook Overseer P. Perumal Naidoo, I have the honor to state as follows:—

Encls. 2.

2. Original letter

I may premise by saying that as Perumal Naidoo was permitted by Government to act as Talook Overseer upon my special recommendation, I should

should naturally be the last person to ask for his removal from the Department except on what I considered to be very urgent grounds for the same.—

2. I have already, in my letter No 755, dated 18th May 1872 pointed out that it is not in consequence of the late Overseer's inefficiency or incompetency, that I have dismissed him from the service; but on account of his morally obliquity of vision and unsatisfactory Conduct in his having not only wilfully falsified an official document and persistently uttered many falsehoods in connection therewith, but also for his having attempted to involve into the case several members of this Department, who are in no way concerned in the matter

matter, and for his having even gone so far as to try to induce the Head Accountant of the Madura Range Office to give false testimony on his behalf, with a view to screen himself from punishment and to bring Overseer Moothoosawmy Pillay into difficulties.—

4. I now enclose the correspondence noted in the Margin, received from the Assistant Engineer Madura Range furnishing the information required in paras 5, 6, and 7 of the above Memorandum.

5. Should the Government consider that the Naidoo has been too severely dealt with by my having recovered from him the sum of Rupees 107—11—4, to meet a portion of the excess expenditure incurred by him without authority on the Police Barracks, I request the favor

* Letter No 393 dated 7th August 1872
do— No 556 dated 3rd October 1872.—

* Reported to Controller, Vide P.O. No 43, 3rd July 1872 on the Statement of objectionable items for March 1872.—

favor of the early orders of Government as to the amount to be repaid to the Naidoo from that already recovered from him; in order to enable me to apply to the Police Department for an allotment of funds to cover the outlay in question. The total excess outlay incurred by the Peroonaul Naidoo is Rupees 139 as already reported by me, while the work is unfortunately so ill-executed that the building is reported to me to leak as badly as it did before it was repaired.- The execution of this work required no particular technical attainments, but mere ordinary care and integrity on the part of the Overseer.-

6. I may mention in conclusion, that my own experience of this Division has convinced me that the natives of this

this part of the country are in the habit of making scandalous imputations on Government Officers, when they find, that those Officers are exercising their best endeavours to see that the interests of Government are not infringed in the transaction of Public business, and as the statement in defence submitted to Government by Peroonal Naidoo did not accompany the Chief Engineer's Memorandum under reply, I shall deem it a favor if the same be transmitted to me for my perusal and eventual return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obed.t Serv.t

Rich.d Roberts Lieut.t Colo.l R.E.

Superint.t Engineer 8.th Div.n

Encl.d

R.E.

No - Cudd: heading

No 653.

Assistant Engineer's office

Madura 1st November 1872.

Despatched 2nd Do.

From,

The Assistant Engineer

In charge of Madura.

To,

The Superintending Engineer

8th Division.

Enclosures:
2. Petitions from Pennaud Naidoo to Government
1. Memorandum from Government
1. Extract from the Administration Report of Madura Range.
1. Statement from Do Lyon
× herewith returned.

Sir,

In reference to your Memo No. 3404 dated 26th October 1872, submitting Memo from Government No. 166 dated 21st Idem forwarding Pennaud Naidoo's petition for consideration and opinion and requesting me for such further remarks I may wish to offer on the several points mentioned in the petition, I have the honor to submit the following notes on the various points which I have numbered in red ink on Pennaud Naidoo's petition.

No. 1. The statement that I continued to report unfavorably of him is false

see

Rd. 13201
Dated 1st Nov. 1872
The Asst. Engineer
In charge
Madura

From
The Superintending Engineer
8th Division

Dated 1st October 1872
Rec'd 15-25 October 1872

Submits further explanation in connection with the disinvestiture of the late Asst. Taluk Overseer P. Pennaud Naidoo and requests to be informed of the reasons for removal & return

see any remarks in Administration Report for 1871-72 dated so late as April 1872 herewith attached - (Permaul Naidoo was dismissed in May following!)

N: 2. It has been remarked in red Pencil this is perfectly false, Moothoo: samy Pillay never assured me that he had been satisfied as to the cause of excess of expenditure and the sufficiency of the unspent balance of the Estimate to complete the work. As I said in my letter to Superintending Engineer dated 7th August 1872 N: 393 and what he did tell me before the Naidoo was, that if he (the Naidoo) would send him a Contractor to complete the work for the balance remaining it would be well, or otherwise he could not undertake it, this Permaul Naidoo agreed to do.

N: 3. Overseer Valoyaodium Pillay entered into Contract with an individual to repair the Barracks, immediately afterwards he left Madurai for Sheva: ganga and by order of Superintending Engineer I put Soobrayaloo Naidoo in charge. I was at the time the work was commenced on circuit. Soobarayaloo Naidoo found the Contractors work bad and reported the same to the Supt Engineer personally who ordered the work to be stopped and this was done. The cost of the actual amount of work done by the Contractor was not more than 40 or 50 Rupees this having been condemned was not paid for. Not more than a couple of squares of tile work was put up and the wastage was very little and 2 rupees worth of new tiles would over and above replace in cost those broken by removal, even this was at

the

the loss to the Contractor not having
been paid for.

No 4 The Head Accountants State-
ment is herewith attached as requested
which is an further instance of Permaul
Naidoos untruthfulness, for what he the
Accountant states actually took place
at the examination before the Superint.
Engineer and myself.

No 5 As I have already stated
Moothoosawmy Pillay told me he
would undertake to complete the work
on condition Permaul Naidoo would
give him Contractors. I was at Coonathoor
at the time I got the Pillay's letter
stating that the Naidoo had failed
to send the men as promised, and under
these circumstances reporting that the
balance remaining was not sufficient
to complete the work - Permaul Naidoo
was with me on circuit at the time,
and

and assured me he would send the
Contractor at once. I made the following
endorsement on the back of the Pillay's
letter "you told me that the work can
be completed within the Estimate, so you
must do your best to do so. I will go
up again for more money". By this, of
course I meant that the arrangements
for completing the work as agreed by
the Averers should be carried out.

The Explanatory report (underlined
in blue on petition) was sent in by Permaul
Naidoo some time after he had drawn
up the Comparative Statement on which
the foot note was made at Tiroomiga-
lum and after the Pillay had signed
the statement see letter No 10 dated 25th
April 1873 from Moothoosawmy Pillay.

No 6 Already explained in No 5

No 7 I am (and always have been)
satisfied that had Permaul Naidoo
carried

carried out the repairs to the Barracks with ordinary care the Estimate was quite sufficient. I examined the work several times before Permaul Naidoo delivered over charge to Moothoosawmy Pillay and as I have already stated in my letter N:555 dated 5th Instant constantly remonstrated with the Naidoo for executing the work in the manner he was doing but he always answered savings were being effected in various items and that the Estimate would not be exceeded. The work done while Soobrayaloo Naidoo had the supervision of the repairs to the building was never paid for, so that the number of times it was taken down should not be taken into consideration.—

N:8. Already explained in former report.

N:9 Already several times proved to be false. Petitioner did promise to

to send his own Contractor but I packed—

N:10 The Vaicar in question was dismissed on the 9th May (for continually absenting himself from duty) the enquiry took place on the 14th and here is another false statement of Permaul Naidoo.—

N:11 The Veroonungalum Talook Cutcherry writer is in no way connected or related to the Head Accountant of my office here is another falsehood.—

N:12. No evidence was taken down in writing by me simply the statements of the writers were sent up to the Superintending Engineer in their own hand writing. The only witnesses brought forward by Permaul Naidoo were the Vaicar already referred to whom after dismissal was employed as his brother's Boundary driver and two outsiders and what these people had to say was word for word what Permaul Naidoo deposed.

As

guilty & two guineas
Cutcherry " — 10 "
Cordukapoo

As I have already reported when the Naidoo was asked for his witnesses he gave only the name of Winter Venkatachellum Iyengar whereas at the enquiry he managed to produce 3 others whose statements are worth, as much as his own.—

I have &c.

(Signed) C. R. Leggatt Assist.o Engineer
In charge of Madura Range.

(True Copy)

No: 3895.

Forwarded for the final orders of Government, with reference to the Chief Engineer's Memo No: 210 dated 25th July 1872.

2. The enclosures called for in the Under Secretary's Memo No: 166 dated 21st October 1872, are herewith forwarded.—

3. The undersigned has little to add to what he has already written on this unpleasant subject. The Post of Taloor Overseer is essentially one of trust, and the Government have a right to claim ordinary honesty of purpose from every individual appointed to that post, otherwise nothing but confusion can be expected as the result.—

4. Permaul Naidoo is lamentably deficient in this respect. He was dismissed by the undersigned not on account of his want of technical experience as Overseer as time would have remedied this, but on account of his slippery ways and want of trustworthiness, defects of character too ingrained, unfortunately, to hold out a hope of ever being eradicated.—

Encloures 16.
1. Letter from Asst Engr Range Cyprus 24th Nov 1872.
1. Comparative statement
1. Letter from Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr dated 10-25th April 1872 with 5 enclosures.
2. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr
1. Letter from Asst Engr

Supt Engineer's Office &c
Circuit Kokraclum.
19th November 1872

Richd Roberts Lieut.t Colo R.E.
Superint.g Engineer 8th Dn.

Compd
E.S.K.

Query — Is he pensioned — or is he to be dismissed — 70
Lord Hobart

P. W. 1872 Allport
Rec.d from Govt. for Stamps
Sobha Singh £3952

The Supt. Engineer
&c &c &c

To The Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D.

Dated 19th November 1872
Rec.d 3rd Decr 72.

Encls: 10

Forwards for the final orders of Government certain correspondence relating to late Overseer P. Perumaul Naicker.

No 3040

the required Estimate, already
submitted to them prepared,
the required Estimate, the roof
of one Room had been taken
down; but upon further Examina-
tion of the roof of other Rooms
intended after the Execution
of the Estimate, I found Certain
Defects, & Decays, & Additional
Materials necessary. The
Works have accordingly been
executed: such as the whole
the Works could not be completed
without the Amount of Estimate.
On my handing over Charge
of the Works to my Successor
I pointed them out to him & their respect
& accordingly entered at Foot
of the Estimate and Remark
"the Decays could not be ascertained
"Lowings and other Items" Under

these

these Circumstances, I have
not thought it necessary to
report to you earlier on the
subject.

I beg to remain
Your Most Obedt Servt
W. Pilkington
Executive Engineer
Dy Yorkshire Division

7820/12. 5202/12.

Read.

The Asst. Clerk Commg.
Seringapatam

&

The Asst. Engineer
Madura Rocks

Dated 16th March
1872

Submitting the plans and
of Certain Sheets
noticed in the
Conservancy
Establishment for the
repair of the Police
Lines &c at Madura.

Nothing marked this
letter by the writer
of the letter which
accompanied the Enclo
to be sent back to
Madras Govt. —

Enclo. No. 4 in a letter
from the Supdt's Rev. Dept.
8th Division dated 18th March
1892.

No. 763

To. The Secretary to Govt.
P.W.D.
Madras.

P.W. 3488
~~2584~~/92.

Letter from the
Actg. Overseer P.
Peroomaub Taluk No.
238 of the 1st March
1892.

Encl: No: 5 in a
letter from the Superin
Engineer & Dy. No: 3875
dated 19th November/72

To

The Secretary to Govt
P. W. D.
Madras.

P. W. 5952/72.

Letter from the Ag.
Overseer P. Peroomal
Naidoo No: 238 of the
1st March 1872.-

Recd 20 Dec 1872 L. B. No 4/82

Translation of a Statement
made in the presence of Assth
Engineer, in charge of Madura-
Range by Veeracchellum Pyen
-gar & (lately Madura Taloo K Ous
-seer & Writer) now 3rd Account
in the Chevagingah Sub Division
made & dated the 9th May 1872.

On the 9th February
1872, when Sroothoovarny Pillay
the present Taloo K Overseer of
Madura, took charge of the Madura
Taloo K. from Peroomal Naick,
the late Ag Taloo K Overseer
of Madura & now in charge
of Sroomungalum Taloo K,
a Comparative Statement

was

[illegible] 1—10—

[illegible] 70

[illegible] Cordially

were prepared by Tiroonungalum
Talookdar Overseer & Witness to Vasan-
i = vanmy Dyer; under the im-
= mediate orders of both Overseer
together; regarding the excess
expenditure incurred on the
Repairs of the Police Barracks
at Madura, as directed to attend to
other important Works on that
date. Subsequently Moothoo =
vanmy Pillay gave the
Statement to me & told me
to examine the same - Both
myself & Moothoovanmy Pillay
examined it - Moothoovanmy
Pillay then asked Peroomal
Naidoo as to what remarks
are to be given for the excess
expenditure

expenditure incurred by him (Peroo
= mal Naick) to which Peroomal
Naick dictated to me certain
remarks which I have inserted
in the Column of Remarks - I
immediately interpreted the
said remarks in Tamil to
Moothoovanmy Pillay, when
Moothoovanmy Pillay signed
the said Statement & then
gave it to Peroomal Naick &
asked him to sign the same -
Peroomal Naick received &
perused the Statement & said
that he will properly look over
it & sign & send it to him
tomorrow (10th February 72)
On a subsequent day as the
Statement

1—10—
Lordships

the Statement was received, unsigned by Peroomal Pillay, from Trincomalee, by the Madras Sloop of Queen, it was again returned to Peroomal Pillay with a Judicial requisition to sign & send the Statement back to Mootthoovenaiy Pillay. It was afterwards received duly signed as required - On the 9th February when I wrote the remarks in the said Statement, the foot note now added to the Statement was not then inserted therein & it is not in my hand writing -

1828/72

Statement of evidence from
Venkatachellum Ayengar

Encls: W.Bro's a Letter from the Superintt Engineer 8th Division dated 16th May 1872.

W. 755.

To. The Secretary to Govt
O.P.W.
Madras.

3458
P.W. ~~2564~~/72.

Statement of Evidence of Vrucatachellum Iyengar, & Accountant Shevagungah Range.

Encls: No. 6. in a
letter from the Supt.
Engineer & Dy. No. 3895
dated 19: November 1872

To

The Secretary to Govt.
P.W.D.
Madras.

P.W. 5952/72.

Statement of Evidence
of Vencatachellum
Iyengar, Accountant
Shevagungah Range.

Recd. 20 Dec 72 L. Bell 4/58

Translation of a Written Statement made
before the Assistant Engineer, Madura
Range, by Nassoumiarany Iyer
Siroomungalum Taluk Overseer
Writer, made & dated the 9th May 1872

After joining Siroomm=
=galum on the 9th March 1872,
Peroomal Naick gave me the
Statement which was prepared
regarding the Repairs of the Police
Barracks at Madura & told me
to despatch it to the Madura
Taluk Overseer - Accordingly
did so - Subsequently the Statement
was returned to Siroommungalum
to be signed & sent back - It was
accordingly signed & returned
on the 16th March - The foot-note
added to the said Statement &
which is referred to by the gentleman
was

Received
February 1872

were written on Seamongaleim
Hercleone Sackenett marriged
by Mr. Thomas Pellay on the
9th March only - The corrections
in the foot note were made by
Personable Jack himself -

Jeff. Tarrannamydyer

9 - 5 - 21 - Witness Herbert.

Question Respecting Marriage
Whether that was the first
note written?

Encls. Copy in a Letter from the Superintending Engineer 8th Division dated 18th May 1872. No. 755

To. The Secretary to Govt. P.W.D. Madras.

3458

P.W. 25th July 72.

Statement of Evidence of Narrainsawmy Iyen Saroomungalum Valuy Overseer Writer.

Encls: No 1 in a
letter from the Supt:
Engineer & Dr No 3875
dated 19th November 1872

To

The Secretary to Govt
P.W.D.
Madras

P.W. 5952/72.

Statement of Evidence
of Narayanasawmy Iyer
Perumungalum Taluk
Overseer's Writer.

Recd 20 Dec 1872 L. Bt Vijsa

From 5/820/72

Taluq Overseer
Madura

To

The Asst. Engineer
in charge of
Madura Range

Dated 25 Apl
Recd } 1872

Enclosers-5

Explanation regarding
Police Barracks at
Madura

P. W. 256a/72

List of Documents accompanying letter
dated 25th april 1872 No.

2

1 Yadast No. 127 dated 13th February/72
1 Do —— No. " — Do 16 Do/72
1 Do —— No. 161 — Do. 9 March/72
1 Do —— No. 172 — Do. 14 Do/72
1 Do.
1 Cararnama —— 16 March/72

25. April 1872 } G. Mullaney
Taluq Overseer

37

9-3-72

17-3-72

No. 10 25 April 1872

G. R. Leggatt Esq. Asst. Engr. in charge of

Sir

I have the honor to submit for your information a statement of Rs. 449-7-5 which is the amount of the Estimate for the repairs to the Police Barrack at Kaidur, which I have this day signed and returned to Sergeant Hayden for submission to the Superintending Engineer.

I have also the honor to forward herewith a statement of Rs. 619-- 8 which is the amount actually expended for that portion of the work which was estimated for at Rs. 950-- being the whole amount of the Estimate for the repairs of the Police Barrack at Kaidur.

I have the honor to be Sir Your most obedient Servant

Enclosures. 5

forwarding all the papers connected therewith
and also stating that the statement above
alluded to will be submitted by your honor
as soon as I receive it.

But on the contrary he returned
the said statement on the 13th February without
his signature and un accompanied with a
yadast and as I found the said statement
not signed by him I was obliged to return it
immediately with my yadast No. 127 requesting
him to sign and send the said statement.

Thereupon he signed the said
statement and sent it to me with his yadast
dated 16 February and during longer at reached
me 19th February I was obliged to submit the
said statement to your honor with my letter
No. 241 dated 19th February without perusing the
small note in English made at the foot of the
statement as I entertained no doubt as to the
correctness of the statement, the same having
been prepared by both of us. And I seen the
said note I might have reported to your honor
on the subject.

I am fully aware the superintending engineer
will reasonably asked me regarding the said
note after perusing it to me. I have explained
to him that it was written after I put my signature
to the letter I have submitted to your honor through
copy of the said statement on the 22nd inst as
your honor wanted it, and the truth is that the
note was subsequently made and existed if your
honor be pleased to peruse the said letter and
the copies of the yadasts to the 13th February
No. 127 & 16th February without No.

3. After the said statement was sent by
your honor to the superintending engineer
the

copy enclosed

here with sent

the said Paramanathaiyar came and told me
that the Contractor whom he may engage
will complete the remaining work within the
Balance of the estimate amount and that
he will himself resume him (Contractor)
whatever assistance he may require in com-
pleting the repairs, and for the requested me
to give him necessary instructions. Therefore
I consented to it.

When he brought me to my chambers
the same day he had reported to your honor
the way he proposed that he had made arrangement
with certain Contractor to finish the remaining
repairs with in the Balance of the estimate
amount to which arrangement I did not object
at that time.

After your honor had given orders directing
me to complete the said work I sent for the man
whom Paroomal haidu had stated he will com-
plete the work and directed him to do so but
he refused to do the work of which I have sent a
yadast to Paroomal haidu and I have also sent
to your honor a copy of the said yadast with my
letter dated 11th March 72 No. 251 and the Paroomal
haidu's reply is also sent now.

No. 161 dated 9th March 1872 herewith sent

Thereupon the said Paroomal haidu
engaged another Contractor to do the work and
he consented in the first day that he will do
it but afterwards he refused to do so. I have re-
ported the matter to your honor personally. (Paroomal
remarqued by the contractor is enclosed).

No. 172 dated 14th March 72

Out of the flat tiles and frantiles that
were cover over the 600 sqft. of roof which forms
a portion of the unrepaired building were applied
for that part of the roof which was already repaired
by Paroomal haidu, and I consented to repair

that

1—10—

70

that part of the ~~road~~ also within the Balance of the Estimate amount according to the revised list of Paromal haidu, I have completed that portion of the work

Had I consented to carry over the remaining repairs within the Balance of Rs 333-14 your honor I beg would observe that I would have had no necessity for submitting to your honor a comparative statement showing the work already ~~exhau~~ executed by Paromal haidu. I therefore request your honor will be pleased to prevent the discrepancies mentioned in the accompanying list as well as those which I have already submitted to your honor.

I beg to remain
Sir
your most obt servt
C. Mylliam
Taluq overseer







[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Encls. W.3 Ens a Letter
from the Superintt Engineer
8th Division dated 18th
May 1872.

No. 755

To The Secretary to Govt
P.W.D.
Madras.
3458
P.W. 2504/72

Letter from the Collector
Trichinopoly No. 10 dated
25th April 1872 with
5 Enclosures.—

Encl: No. 3. in a letter
from the Supt: Engineer
S. Division No. 3895 dated
19th November 1872.-

To

The Secretary to Govt
P.W.D.
Madras.

P.W. 5952/72.

Letter from the Salo
Overseer Moothoosawmy
Pillay No. 10 dated
25. April 1872 with
5 enclosures.

Rec'd 20 Dec 1872 & D.K. 4958

No. 13

Tripomungalum
16th April 1872

To

G.R. Leggatt Esquire
Asst. Engineer
Madura Camp

Sir,

In obedience to the instructions of the Superintending Engineer Contained in Memo No. 40, of the 13th instant, I beg respectfully to inform you that I will pay up the Sum of Rs 149 on the 10th proximo without fail.

2 I beg to bring to the favorable notice of the Superintending Engr the fact which I believe has already prominently to his notice, that Overseer Moorooseawmy Pillay, who first satisfied himself as to the sufficiency of the remaining amt of the Estimate to complete the work & admitted the fact before you as well as by a note at foot of the Comparative statement, has subsequently made an Official Complaint that the work could not be Completed within the Estimate

Being fully aware of the responsibility that attaches me, in handing over this incomplete work to my Successor, & Consequently suggested to him, that should he doubt the adequacy of the amt to Carry on the work to Completion, the work may be

Clerk to Engineer 73

lee entrusted to me. She then gave his Consent to undertake the work himself & asked me to enter the foot note that the works could lee Completed from Lavings or other items (He has since verbally informed me that he has effected a Saving on Certain items) This admission on the part of Mootoocaumy Pillay is not Consequent on any good feeling which he ever had towards me, but simply the fact, which he admitted before the Range Office, of which allusion is also made in the Rangoon to the Revenue, praying, order me to Cancelling that no Contractor Consent to do the work.

4 In executing the work I found that the to the Centre portion of the building is too expensive for any perfect acquaintance with the nature of the work required to the building on other portions Enfamed any belief that the remaining work, being too less Could lee done for the amount available Had the execution of the work been entrusted to me, as Solicited there would have been no occasion for a Complaint as the present one & I would not have received any such reprimand so early, when my future prospects do depended on

sw good work & honest habits.

5 I beg to add that Considering the promotion in the office branch is limited as far as my Case is Concerned, I prefered this present employment & I very much fear that the Censure to which I am now subjected, may perhaps represent the result of a dishonest action on my part & be a great bar to my future improvement in the executive branch.

6. I therefore most earnestly request that the execution of the work may be entrusted to me to enable me to Complete it.

I beg to remain
Your Most Obt Servt
Signd P. Pennaul Maurice
Ag Salook Overseer

(True copy)

Asst Engr
Dutch of Madura Paye

Clerk & Examiner — 73/70 Lordships

8/623/72

From

The Agt. Talook Cutcherry
Veroomany Aluru

To The Asst. Collr.
Alloor Range

Date 16th April 1872

Herewith explanations
regarding the excess ex-
penditure on the Police
Peons at Veadavu

Encls: No 5 to a Letter
from the Supdt's Engineer
8th Division dated 18th May
1872.

No 755

To. The Secretary to Govt
PWD.
Madras.

3458
P.W. ~~2500~~ /72.

Letter from the Acts
Overseer P. Perumaub
Reddoo. No 13 of the
16th April 1872. —

When I say I am-
sible that Permit-
ee should have
liberty to have
their Work
Inspected by some Inden-
ted Civil Servant
to be allowed to
Inspection it is Complete
Sirrees.

Enclo: No 4 in a letter
from the Supt: Engineer
S. D. No 3695 dated
19: November 1872.

To

The Secretary to Govt.
P.W.D.
Madras.

P.W. 5952/72.

Letter from the Ag:
Overseer P. Perumal
Naidoo No 13 of the
16: April 1872

Rec: 20 Dec 1872 in Bdle 4784

Showing the particulars of works for the Repairs of Police Barracks at Madura

Description of work	Amount of Estimate			Work done since last date			Balance to be done			Amount		Balance due		Remarks
	Contract	Rate	Amount	Contract	Rate	Amount	Contract	Rate	Amount	Contract	Amount	Each	Amount	
No 1 Vengay wood Rafters 3	1-4-4	3	4 14				1-4-4	3	4 14					
Jungle wood Purlins 4	1 19/32	2 8	3 15 9				1 19/32	2 8	3 15 9					
Do Uprights 5	2 7/16	2 8	5 2 6				2 7/16	2 8	5 2 6					
Vengay wood beams 1	6-1-1½	3	18 14 2				6-1-1½	3	18 14 2					
1 Do Scantlin	1 11/16	3	5 1				1 11/16	3	5 1					
No 2 5 Vengay wood Rafters	1-10-5	3	5 9 8	1-6-8	3	1 10 8						1-3	2 15	
3 Jungle wood Purlins	1 9/8	2 8	4 1	1 1/8	2 8	2 13						1/2	1 1½	
5 Do Uprights	2 1/2	2 8	6 4									2½	6 4	
2 Vengay wood Planks	8-7½	3	2 2 6	8-4	3	2 1 4							3½	
No 3 31 Vengay wood Rafters	21-7-11	3	64 15 8	21-8-11	3	65 3 10				1-12	4 2			22 Rafters on hand
8 Jungle wood Purlins	4 1/8	2 8	10 5	6 1/8	2 8	15 10				2 1/8	5 5			one used
4 Do Uprights	1 15/32	2 8	3 10 9	1 7/8	2 8	4 11				13/32	1 3			
3 Vengay wood Planks	3-4½	3	13 6									3½	13 6	
1 Do Scantlin	1 3/8	3	4 2				1 3/8	3	4 2/8					
No 4 17 Vengay wood Rafters A	9-10-5	3	29 9 8	13-11-5/8	3	41 11 10				4-1-3 7/8	12 5 2			16 Rafters on hand
3 Jungle wood Uprights B	1 5/16	2 8	2 15 6	1 21/32	2 8	11 10 3				3 15/32	8 10 9			used
6 Vengay wood Planks	1-3-4½	3	3 13 6	1-1-11	3	2 12						1-1½	1 1 6	
No 5 15 Vengay wood Rafters	12-7-4	3	37 13 4	13-4-2	3	40 8				8-8-10	2 3 4			12½ Rafters
8 Jungle wood Purlins	4 1/16	2 8	10 2 6	1 29/64	2 8	3 10 1						2 39/64	6 8 5	on hand
2 Do Uprights	7/8	2 8	2 3	15/32	2 8	1 2 9						13/32	1 3	
1 Vengay wood wall Plate	7-6	3	1 4	7-11	3	1 15 8				5	1 8			
No 6 7 Vengay wood Purlins	1 1/16	2 8	3 2				1 1/2	2 8	3 2					
Do Uprights	25/32	2 8	1 15 3				25/32	2 8	1 15 3					
Rooms No 7 1 Vengay wood Planks	2	3	8				2	3	8					
1 Jungle wood Purlins	1/2	2 8	1 4				1/2	2 8	1 4					
2 Do Uprights	1 1/8	2 8	2 13				1 1/8	2 8	2 13					
7 Vengay wood Rafters	4 5	3	12 1 8				4 5	3	12 1 8					
4 Do Beams	18-3-1/8	3	54 12 4				18-3-1/8	3	54 12 4					
1 Do Planks	1-8-3	3	5 1				1-8-3	3	5 1					
Verandah 45 Verandah Rafters	20	3	90	10	3	30	20	3	60					
Sawn mofussil white wood	600	4	150	31.0	4	85	260	4	65					
Plastering 2 coats of Chunam	2031½	3	60 15 3				2031½	3	60 15 3					
Setting down the Sy bricks of floors & replacing with Sy tiles	1485	3	44 8 9				1485	3	44 8 9					
of New Sy bricks in Chunam			105 8 11											
Pointing floor with Sy bricks with fine ground	1353	6	5 1 2				1353	6	5 1 2					
Shifting floors & partitions of Chunam C														
Cooly with Sy portion of the new Verandah C	9152	2	228 12 9	5190	5	259 8	3982	2	99 8 9		129½ 8			
New windows & shutters			5						5					
Do doors Do			5						5					
Total Rupees			896 15 6											
Sundries & Superintendence			53 6				19 13 10		33 2 8					
Total Rupees			950				589 2 7		538 00 8 4		157½ 0		220 15 10	
									Moiety in hand	29 11 1				
										570 10 6				

9 February 1872.

The amount of Rupees 570-10-6 from the Sowcar of Police Stores

G. Mallesom Esq
Executive Engineer

V. Ponnaiah Collector
for Police Stores

Asst. Engineers Office

Encls: No. 2 is a letter from the Superint. Engineer 8 "Division dated 18th May 1872. No. 755

To. The Secretary to Govt. PWD. Madras.

3458
P. W. 2560/72

Comparative Statement

Encls: No: 2 in a
letter from the Supt.
Engineer & D. No: 3195
dated 19: November/72

To

The Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D.
Madras.

P. W. 595 2/72.

Comparative State
=ment.—

From 20 Dec/72 to 6 Feb/73

Afs: Engineers Office
24th May 1872

No 114

Encls 12
1 Comparative Statement—
1 Letter from Overseer
Moothoo Sammy Pillay &:
dated 10-5-72 with 5 enclosures
2 Letters from Ag. Overseer
Permaul Naidu &: dated 23 & 13
1 Statement of Evidence from
Venkatachellum Vyenga—
1 Do: Do: Narayanaswamy
Vyer—
1 List of document from the
Supt. Engr. 8: D: 27 May/72

From

The Afs: Engineer
Vin ch of Madura Range

To

The Supt. Engineer
8th Division

Vis/

Vin reference to your Memo
No: 435 dated 1st May 1872 Calling
upon me to report upon the excess
Expenditure that has been incurred
by Ag. Paluy Overseer Permaul
Naidu on the Police Barracks
at Madura, as well as on his
Conduct, in after having done
so, attempting to make Overseer
Moothoo Sammy Pillay res=
=ponsible for it, by inserting
in a foot note on the Compa=
=rative Statement, Viz: "Excess
can be met from saving from
other items" without the knowledge
of & after the Pillay had signed
the Statement, I have the
honor to inform you that I
have

Clerk & Examiner — 75
70

have done so & beg to bring the following to your notice.

Permaul Naidoo in attempting to clear himself even in the investigation before me, has been guilty of the most barefaced & unpardonable falsehoods. In the first instance when the enquiry took place at your office before us, he stated that with the exception of writer Venkatachullum Iyengar there were no other witnesses present when (at Head Asst. Gopaul Iyer house) Mootoosamy Pillay agreed to carry out the balance of work remaining to be done to the Barracks for the balance remaining unexpended (or in other words 500 Rs. of work for Rs 360.)

After delaying the investigation by shamming illness for 3 days, he brought forwards 3 other witnesses his Lascar & two outsiders) whom he declares were present, these three tell the same story as Permaul Naidoo & what to me looks

Suspicious

Suspicious is that they give their evidence in almost the same words. & it is Extraordinary that though Permaul Naidoo was constantly with me both in Tiroomungalum & after I came in here, he never once mentioned these witnesses to me or that he had any others besides the Iyengar.

Venkatachullum Iyengar denies all knowledge of the statements made by Permaul Naidoo, his evidence I beg to submit.

From writer Narayanasamy Iyer's evidence enclosed, you will see that he wrote the foot note at Tiroomungalum.

What appears to me to be a most Extraordinary & unaccountable proceeding on the part of Permaul Naidoo is, that he did not sign the Comparative statement & write the foot note in the presence of Mootoosamy Pillay & before leaving for Tiroomungalum where

Clerk & Examiner

Cordeliers

where he was not emergently required (for it would not have taken him 5 minutes to do so). & after the innumerable, false statements he has made both in the investigations held at your Office, & in that I have now held on the subject I am convinced that he premeditated with malicious intent to bring Mootoosawmy Pillay into trouble by inserting the notes in question in the manner it has been proved he did

Mootoosawmy Pillay's Statements & evidence have been throughout above board; & far from endeavouring to bring Permaul Naidoo into trouble as he (Permaul Naidoo) insinuates, I am of opinion the Pillay had endeavoured to do his best towards bringing the matters to some amicable arrangement with him before reporting the matter officially.

The only excuse Permaul Naidoo makes for having exceeded the rates in the various items shewn

therein in the Comparative Statement is that it was owing to his having been compelled by you to carry out the work by Amanee instead of by Contract, but this of course is absurd. the fact of the matter is he is thoroughly incompetent & untrustworthy for the position of Overseer.

In conclusion I think it but my duty to inform you that Permaul Naidoo came to me with a long story a few days after the investigation that was held in your Office regarding the foregoing subject, & stated that your Head Estimate maker Maureappa Moodaliyar with two or three others were endeavouring to ruin him by misrepresenting matters to you, & that you were subsequently unjust in the investigation, in so much as you did not examine his witnesses, whereas you are aware

Your Lordships

Clerk & Examiner — 75/70

aware that the witnesses naming by him viz. Head Accountant Gopaul Iyen who was examined before us, stated that the Naidoo tried to induce him to give false testimony & writer Venkatachellum Iyingar, also named by him who was not forth Coming, when sent for at the time, although I warned Permaul Naidoo to have his witnesses ready for your Examination) declares the statements made to be false & I consider a man who has been guilty of such conduct as Permaul Naidoo to be a most dangerous individual to retain in the Service in any Capacity.

I have &c.

E. Blaquiere Asst. Engr.

Varkey of Madura Pauye

61

No 114 828

From
The Asst. Engineer
Work op. Madura Range

Vo
The Supg. Engineer
8th Division

Dated 14th
Recd 15-3 May 1872

Encls 12

Reports the results of the
enquiry held as to the excess
expenditure incurred by Agn. Foreg
Overseer Fernando Arudoo on the
Police Barrack works.

Enclosure. No. 1 in a letter from the Superintending Engineer 8th Division dated 18th May 1872.

No. 755

To The Secy to Govt
PW.
Madras.

3458
P.W. 258/72.

Letter from the Madura Range Officer No. 114 of. the 14th May 1872. reporting the result of Enquiry into the Case. against the Acts Talug Peroman Peroomaul Naidoo.—

...ware) that the witnesses ...

Encls: No. 1. in a
letter from the Superintg
Engineer S. Dr. No. 3895
dated 19: November 1872

To

The Secretary to Govt.
P. W. D
Madras.

P. W. 5952/72.

Letter from the Madura
Range Officer No. 114 of
the 14: May 1872, report-
ing the result of enquiry
into the case against
the Ag: Salug Overseer
P. Peroomal Naidoo—

Rec.d 20th Dec.r 72 Ls B No. 478a

To

His Excellency the Right
Honorable the Governor in
Council
Fort Saint George

The humble Petition of P. Peroomal
Naidoo late Ag Salook Overseer
Tiruvungalum Salook Madura District
& Clerk & Examiner in the Superintending
Engineer's Office 8th Division residing
at Madura

Most humbly & respectfully sheweth
& that it may please
that your Lordships to revise
the sentence entered the Public Service in
the Public Works Department of the
Madura District in 1856 as Writer and Rs 14
Writer in the District Engineers and held the appointments
Office Salary Rs 20 as shewn in the margin
Head Accountant
Coindigul Range " 30 and discharged the duties
Writer & Accountant connected thereof to the
Madura Range Office " 30 entire satisfaction of his
5th & 2 Accountant & Superiors, Copies of which
Estimate marked
District Engr's Office " 35 8 4 5 testimonials are herewith
4th, 3, 2nd & Head Accountant forwarded for your
in the Engr's
Office _____ " 30 4 0 6 0 8
Clerk & Examiner " — 7 5
— 7 0

Lordships

Lordship's kind perusal.

The Petitioner was appointed to the last mentioned Office by Colonel F. J. Mouatt, R.E. in 1865 & since then & upto March 1871, he had Charge of the Circuit Office of the Superintending Engineer & gained the favorable opinion of the gentlemen named in the margin.

Colonel F.J. Mouatt R.E.
Major H. Le Prevost R.E.
Colonel C.W. Wilkinson R.E.
Major G.W. Payne R.C.

2. Colonel R.A. Roberts the present Superintending Engineer being also satisfied with the Petitioners conduct and abilities as stated in the letter to Government printed in G.O. No. 2446 of the 25th September 1871, appointed the Petitioner as Mg. Talook Overseer Madura Talook & the Government have in the G.O. ordered quoted authorized his appointment on probation for 12 months. The Petitioner conducted the duties of this Office to the satisfaction of the Superintending Engineer, who has also recorded his high opinion of the Petitioners work, in letter to the Range Officer on the subject of the Police Bath room lately constructed by the Petitioner, and Extract from which is annexed for your Lordships perusal.

No. 2872

Extract of Superintending Engineers Memo to the Range Officer dated 18th January 1872.

Para. 2 The Superintending Engineer & the guide awards that the Mg. Talook Overseer Veerappan Servants Naicker has little technical & experience previous to his appointment as Mg. Overseer, cannot allow such a sweeping accusation against him to be recorded without a protest on his part.

Para. 3 The Police Bath-room that has been recently constructed at Madura is the best work of the kind that has been done by the Department in Madura for the last few years.

Para 4. The work that was done to the Police Barracks by Overseer Govindaraja Naidu & which the Superintendent of Police designated as disgraceful is certainly superior than any work that has been executed by Overseer Naicker.

Para 5 In his remarks that accompanied his administration report for 1870-71 the great energy displayed by Overseer Balakrishna

Inadulian

Mudaliar is prominently noticed while Assistant Valayuthum Pillai was subsequently recommended for promotion as Superintendent. Now there can be no doubt that Paramanandam Naidu is far superior to either of the aforesaid two individuals and Questioner

Para 6. The undersigned has applied without appeal to the Principal of the Civil Engineering College Madras for two Overseers. If Mr Leggatt has any wish to bring forward in that capacity he is requested to do so."

3. The Range Officer who always disliked the members of the Superintending Engineer's Office objected to the Petitioners appointment as Assistant in his Range & has continued to report unfavourably of him whenever he pleased.

4. In illustrating how the Petitioner was transferred at his own request to Triomengalam Taluk Mr Moothoosamy Pillay a wealthy & very influential Overseer, who formerly held charge of the Triomingalam Taluk for more than 12 years & lately long duty in the Pudupettai Taluk of the Pudiyur Range

Range having been transferred to the Madura Taluk to succeed the Petitioner, he delivered over charge of all the works to his successor. The repair of the Police Barracks which was incomplete in view of the many works he handed over & the Petitioners success in measuring the work done to the above buildings made out that a sum of Rs. 149 (since corrected to 139) has been suspended Over the work more than the Estimate & prepared a Comparative statement to that effect to be signed by the two Overseers & forwarded to the Range Officer together with the usual transfer Certificate. The Petitioner then explained to his successor how the excess suspenditure arose & satisfied him as to the sufficiency of the unspent balance of the Estimate to complete the works.

5. Your Lordship's petitioner most humbly begs to represent here the circumstances connected with the repair of the Police Barracks under reference.

An Estimate of Rs. 620 had been framed & sanctioned for the repair

V.

of the building. The necessity of the work
had originally been communicated to the
Overseer in charge of the Srivamalay
Naiks Palace works. The Overseer used
inferior materials & carried out the
work very badly & the work Boarded by
him was therefore condemned by the 3
Superintendent of Police & Superintending
Engineer as will be seen from the
extract of the Superintending Engineers
letter to the Range Officer above annexed.
The execution of the work was therefore
subsequently transferred to the Petitioner.
The Petitioner examined the roof of the
building & found additional work
work necessary. He reported the fact
to the Range Officer & on his permission
granted examined & estimated for Rs. 950
including the rates sanctioned
in the original Estimate of Rs. 620,
being perfectly aware at the time that
the rate of Rs. 2-8 per square through
very few will cover the cost of the roof,
a portion only of it requiring increased
quantity of tiles &c & the other equally
less wooden, and submitted the same
to the Range Officer for sanction. The Petitioner
did at the same time authorize & suggested
the original allotment of Rs. 620 & with this

this mine-pher repaired the worst portions
of the roof by daily labor, leaving the
better portion to be repaired when
additional money is made available.
The roof repaired under the Petitioners
supervision was that where the Srivam-
alay Naiks Palace Overseer did work
& which was condemned by the Superin-
tending Engineer & this portion the
original condition of which was very
bad was therefore never taken down
and put on again. Planed & large
wastage of tiles &c were necessitated &
Your Lordship's petitioner
in explaining these facts to his successor
suggested that if the work be left to
his charge he will complete it within
the Estimate amount & also told him
that he will speak to the Range Officer
on the subject & their consequent
time statement prepared as in para 4-
Accordingly yesterday i.e. 10 day there pre-
pared his readiness to complete the
work within the available sum under
his own supervision & accordingly asked
him in the presence of the Range Head
Accountant & under a foot note in the
Comprehensive statement to the effect "that
Petitioner agreed to complete the work within the
above estimate" but Report Superintending Engineer the
Accountant, refused to do so.

4 × Rs. 330

the Excess could be met from Savings on other Items. This remark Bwas accordingly written & the Statement sent to the Petitioners Successor: but it so happened that the Petitioners Office writer wrote the Note & sent it on after without obtaining Petitioners signature thereto, but his successor returned it for his signature with the undermentioned Gadaal. The Statement was accordingly signed, and returned back to him & the Range Officer subsequently forwarded it to the superintending Engineer with his remarks that the Excess Expenditure had been incurred without his Knowledge & authority

Faniil Gadaal

From C. M. Mookhoorjemmy Pillay
Jr Overseer Talook Overseer
To C. Provincial Engineer.
Talook Overseer Tirunnuvelum.

I received on the 13th the Statement of the Police Barracks & on perusing it I find it is not signed. I therefore request that you will sign and return the same to me. I am precluded from sending it to the Range Officer without your signature.

13th February 1872
Madura

Signed in English C. M. Mookhoorjemmy Pillay
Talook Overseer

On the 1st March 1872 when the Petitioner & his successor happened to meet the Range Officer he asked Overseer Mookhoorjemmy Pillay in the Petitioners presence whether he could complete the work within the Estimate amount. He said he could & the Range Officer then directed the Petitioner to give him a written explanation on the subject for submission to the Superintg. Engineer. He accordingly forwarded said Explanatory report referring also to the good note in the Statement already forwarded.

On the 9th March 1872 Overseer Mookhoorjemmy Pillay sent a Gadaal to the Petitioner to the effect that no Contractor was willing to complete the work within the Estimate & that the Petitioner should appoint & send a man who could complete the work within the end of the Official year & also requested the Range Officer in writing, to direct the Petitioner to send a Contractor of his own. The Range Officer thereupon sent him the following reply

No. 1344

Communication
14th March 1872

You are told to tell that the work can be completed within the Estimate,

do you must try your best to do so. Or
will not go up again for more money.
Signed / G. R. Leggatt.

Asst Engineer

The Petitioner's answer in reply to the
Answer stating that as he is busily
engaged at a distance of from 20 to 30
miles from Madura he is unable to
comply with her request.

9 On the receipt of the Rangé
Officers Memo above annexed Queeren
Moothoosawmy Pillay employed as
Contractor who was willing to undertake
to complete the work within the balance of
the Estimate & tendered an agreement
on Stamped paper for him to that effect.
In this Agreement the Deceased included
certain work which is not in the Estimate
& the Contractor after signing the agree-
ment finding that additional Expen-
diture had been incurred refused to under-
take the work.

10 The Deceased Moothoosawmy
Pillay subsequently informed the Su-
perintending Engineer of his inability
to complete the work within the Estimate
amount & the latter accordingly issued
cancelled dated 9th April (on mention
of which made of the falsifying of public
document upto this date) declining that

that the Increase of Rs. 149 should be made
good by the Petitioner.

11 On receipt of the above order
the Petitioner informed in writing
that he will keep up the sum on the
10th May & at the same time detailed all
that had actually taken place in the
matter. This letter having been sub-
mitted to the Supt Engineer, he while
passing an order adhering to his for-
mer restriction referred to the following
portion of the statement of the late
Overseer Moothoosawmy Pillay informed
the Superintending Engineer that the
Increase could be met from savings
on other items & vide order on the
statement called the Pillay has signed
it without his authority or consent
& even knowledge and at the same
time called Moothoosawmy Pillay
& he flatly denied (there is nothing to
show that such a call is made any
mention of this by immediate
Superiors the Range Officer)

12 On receipt of the Quarterly Re-
plication and enquiry was held in
the presence of the Supt. Engineer the
Range Officer & one of the Pa-
sat forth

set forth in the Petitioners reports.

The 1st point enquired into by him is whether the foot note in the Statement was written with or without the knowledge of his successor.

The Rangers Head Draughtsman who is the principal witness & in whose presence the insertion of the foot note was asked for by the Petitioners successor, deposed 1st that he knew nothing in the matter, 2dly that the two Engineers were talking about the Police Barracks & he did hear that the Petitioner began by him to be false evidence against his successor.

The 2d point is why was the Contract not furnished by the Petitioner originally refused to do the work for the balance of the Estimate the Petitioner declined to engage to complete the work himself & his successor gave him the Charge of doing so, & why the Petitioner has stated that he was not allowed to carry out the work himself when such was desired.

To this the production of Lieutenant Davis's Letter to show that all that was asked

him was the supplying of a Contractor for completing the work in the time of the Official year or within 2 months time to be employed at the money of his successor & that he was then never offered the chance of completing the work under his superintendence & this he could & that he never before furnished every Contractor who, it is stated, after was refused to do the work.

On the 1st May 1872 the Executive Engineer here issued a Circular suspending Petitioner & called on the Range Officer for explanation of the case, which in the face of the Engineers subordination of the contents of the foot note dated by the Range Officer dated 2nd para 8, was not allowed.

Whereupon your Lordship's Petitioner petitioned to the Superintending Engineer & stated the true facts of the case & his readiness to carry out the work (D.13) & requested that he should be permitted to remain in his substantive appointment of Clerk Examiner in his Office, to which the Superintending Engineer passed the following Endorsement

No

No 473

Perowne and Nardu having ...
Investigation conducted by the
Superintending Engineer ...
numbered ... fictitious ...
with the view of getting Quarrees ...
to annoy Pillay into trouble will
most probably be examined by
Counsel for wilfully false ...
public document whereby he might
accomplish his ... against the
Quarrees.

I ... the result of the ...
now ordered by the Superintending
Engineer is made known ...
Perowne and Nardu from suspension.

Signed / Rt Roberts Lt Colonel
Supt Engineer 8th Circ

14 The Range Officer was ... for the
Petitioner & others & conducted the
investigation. The Petitioner proved
that the Jock noted in the Statement ...
written and mentioned ... Quarrees ...
to annoy Pillay that the Petitioner
never furnished any Contractor ...
Certain other ...

One of the witnesses examined
was the Quarrees Peroven who was also
present when the Conversation about

9

10

the Jock noted took place. This Witness
has been dismissed ... the
said ... enquiry was held.

The ... of the Talook Assis-
tant Officer Madras & Tiruvannamalai
was examined on the Petitioners side
who deposed that Mootoosawmy Pillay
signed the Statement before the Jock
was written.

Of the above two witnesses the
Tiruvannamalai Talook Quarrees Writer
was related by the Range Head Accountant
to the Defendant Mootoosawmy Pillay
and was under his support until
he was appointed to ... the room of
his deceased brother who was also
his dependant.

The other witness, though ... under Mootoosawmy Pillay for a
short time, being afraid of the Range
Head Accountant who is a very
influential friend & who has already
stirred Talukdars against the
Petitioner dare not ... against the
painful necessity to ... against
his Conscience. The evidence of these
two ... were taken down ... but
pressing ... that the evidence adduced
on the Petitioners side were only heard.

11

12

15

15 The Range Officer having thus concluded the examination forwarded his report, the contents of which the Petitioner believed to be favorable to Mootooswamy Pillay's request to the Petitioner without the Petitioner's written demand. Whereupon the Superintending Engineer has issued an order of dismissal under the following grounds, without ever waiting till the Petitioner finally delivered charge of his work to Mootooswamy Pillay who had orders to take charge of the Division and Taluk also.

1st For having delivered false. fied an Official document with a view of procuring another Taluk Overseer.

2. For having been convicted of the most base faced and unpardonable falsehood.

16 Your Lordship will perceive that with regard to the 1st the denial of Overseer Mootooswamy Pillay of the fact of the post having been written at his request & the statement of the Range Head Clerk by whom it was delivered to be worthy of credit, taken as sufficient grounds for the dismissal of the Petitioner from the Government service

X

serviced, in spite of the truths elicited by the Range Officer's letter to the Overseer as to the correctness of the foot note under reference. The statement in question passed backwards & forwards thro' the Overseer's hands, signed by him in English, Tamil & submitted by him to the Range Officer & its contents admitted before him by saying that the work could be completed within the estimate & yet he screened himself with a false statement that he did not peruse the contents of the statement at the time of sending it to the Range Officer & so on. If the Petitioner is consequently charged with "falsifying public document". Your Lordship's poor petitioner most humbly begs to add that the decision of the Superintending Engineer, that the Petitioner has falsified public document would have been just, had the statement in question been sent to the Petitioner on any account after signature by both parties or had the Petitioner been afforded of any chance of seeing it again. According to the Overseer's

Yadava

15 Gradual quoted in para 6, the Petitioner signed the Statement & retained it to him & he has not seen it again except at the Superintending Engineers table during the investigation of the Case.

With regard to the 16, the Petitioner is quite at a loss to know what unpardonable falsehoods he has uttered in the present Case.

17 If your Lordship will be graciously pleased to call for & perruse the Comparative Statement & all the Correspondence that has passed on the subject of the repair of the Police Barracks, between Overseers Range Officer, & the Superintending Engineer, the correctness of the Petitioners statement will be evident.

Your Lordships poor petitioner has served Government for nearly 15 years without any single instance of any kind & has for a period of 6 years held a higher & responsible post as Clerk & Examiner, having had charge of the Superintending Engineers Circuit Office & was considered trustworthy by all Gentlemen of long standing especially during the enquiries of grand larceny conducted by Major R. F. Oakes & Major G. M. Payne in the Simanelly District & the former Gentleman also is fully aware of the Petitioners conduct during that time.

18 As your Lordships poor petitioner is unjustly dismissed from the Government employment through which he earned his livelihood, he most earnestly beseeches that your Lordship will be mercifully pleased to grant him justice.

And for which act of charity Your Lordships poor Petitioner &c in duty bound shall ever pray.

P. Perumaul Chetty

Colaccamund
3rd July 1872

Certificate

The bearer Peermaund Naik served in my Office from the 28th August 1856 to the 16th April 1857, as an Unlicensed Writer on Rs. 20 per mensem. On the 16th April 1857 he was placed on the Establishment of Lieutenant J. H. Warden Asst. Engineer Madura District on Rs. 30 per mensem. His reinstatement below in consequence of the reduction of the Establishment of the D. P. W. which took place in July 1857, and from the 1st August 1857 he occupied this old situation on addition-al on Rs. 20 per mensem. It gives me great pleasure to be able to state that I have always found Peermaund Naik a most efficient public Servant and that I have heard Lieutenant Warden speak of him in the highest terms. I trust this certificate may be of use to a most deserving man who is a sufferer from the reductions in the D. P. W through no fault of his own

(Signed) C. Scott Lieut. R.E.
Executive Engineer
Madras
September 17th 1857

Certified
Com. C. Cotton & Miners

Peermaund Naik has been my Estimate-maker & Accountant during the time I was in the Madura District. I have on all occasions exceedingly pleased with his behaviour and his very close attention to his duties,

which

which have invariably been performed with the greatest Zeal and Fidelity. The Accounts of the Office have always been kept regularly and correctly. He is believed to be a thoroughly trustworthy good fellow, who has not only great ability, but abroad all, he always shewn a desire to give satisfaction. He is thrown out of employment in consequence of the removal Bonds to D.P.W. and I sincerely sorry for the loss he may sustain thereby, but I am glad to hear that he is again employed & do not know of any higher salary than that he has been in receipt of, for which he is fully competent.

Signed/ H. Ward Lieut Col
Chief Engineer
July 31st 1857

I have much pleasure in certifying that Peroomaul Naiker Writer of the 1st Class Rangers Office Establishment of the Madras Pioneers who has been under my orders from the 6th of April to the 31st October 1860, while in charge of the 1st Circle, & to whom that during that period he has given much satisfaction in the performance of his duties, he has also acted as an Extra Accountant & Accountant of the Office during the absence of the permanent Servant on leave & has fulfilled the duties of that Office most satisfactorily: he is well conducted & very attentive to his duties. I can also state that he is competent for a higher place in the Department than the one he is now employed in.

Madura 12th November 1860

/ Signed / C. H. Dodgson
Commanding Officer
D.P.W.

Pamban
14th February 1862

I was in charge of 1st Circle Madura District for five months & the opinion I formed during that time of Peroomaul Nayadu was that he was an excellent Accountant & hardworking & willing Office Servant.

/ Signed / F. G. Hankin Captain
Superintendent of
Operation Pumbun

This is to certify that Peroomaul Naick was employed in my Office from the 1st of November 1861 till the end of July 1862. I found him during that period to be a painstaking and intelligent man and well up in the Accounts of the Range.

Madura August 31st 1862

/ Signed / W. Cunningham Lieutt

Peroomaul Naick has served under General Officers, and all have been highly satisfied with him.

He is good Accountant & is perfectly conversant in Surveying.

/Signed/ P. C. Royer Captain
Madura Dist. Engineer
14-4-62

Peroomaul Naick has been employed under me as Head Clerk & Accountant since 1860 to the present time, during which period his conduct has been uniformly satisfactory to me.

/Signed/ G. W. Payne Captain
Madura Acting District Engineer
9th May 1863

Peroomaul Naick did his duty to my satisfaction while I was in charge of the District.

/Signed/ W. Huddlestone
Madura 1st Asst. District Engr.
4th October 1862

Peroomaul Naick's conduct since he has been under my orders fully authorizes me to endorse the Character given to him by Captain Royer.

/Signed/ G. W. Payne Captain
Madura Acting District Engineer
9th May 1863

Peroomaul Naick has done his duty satisfactorily in the different places he has held during my stay in the 8th Division

/Signed/ F. J. Probert Lieut Colonel
18th December 1865

A very useful Office servant he has always accompanied me in marching about the Division - deligent and painstaking; and well up in the Office records & correspondence.

/Signed/ H. L. Prendergast Captain
14th March 1868. RE

Peroomaul Naick has always accompanied me in all my marchings about and I always found him active and well up in the former correspondence & records. I have a very high opinion of his abilities and shall be always glad to hear of his promotion.

/Signed/ C. V. Wilkinson Colonel
19th September 1868 Supg Engineer 8th Div. RE

Peroomaul Naidoo was with me constantly for four years, as Head Clerk and Accountant and was very useful Office servant, both in Office, and in Camp. The records were well kept by him when travelling; and the Camp Office work carefully conducted. On looking back I think it much to Peroomaul Naidoo's Credit, that he remained so steadily on duty: Considering that he was frequently absent for long periods from his home.

/Signed/ Hew L. Prendergast Captain RE
Madras Lately Offg Supg Engineer
13th May 1870 8th Div.

P. Perumaul Naidu joined the Department in August 1856, and after holding several Appointments in the Ranges and Superintending Engineer's Offices was made Head Clerk & Examiner of the latter Office on the 1st June 1865. He holds good testimonials from my predecessors. I have found him a very steady hard-working man - well acquainted with the routine duties of the Superintending Engineer's Office, which he has performed with great industry and to my entire satisfaction.

Signed / G.W. Payne Major
16. S. C.

Palamcottah
28th February 1870

(True Copies)

P. Perumaul Naidu

To

Colonel G.W. Walker R.E
Secretary to Government
&c. &c. &c.

The humble Petition of
P. Perumaul Naidu late
Clerk & Examiner of the Superintending Engineer's Office
8th Division & Acting Taluk
Overseer Srivaikundam and Taluk
Madura District.

Most Honored Sir

With every mark of respect
I beg leave most respectfully
to submit herewith my humble
Memorial to His Excellency the
Right Honorable the Governor in
Council laying my distressed
& helpless case in connection with
my dismissal from the Government
service by the Superintending Engineer
8th Division & most humbly request
that your honor will be pleased
to take into consideration all

Hon.

Encls No 8 in a letter from the Supdg: Engineer S. D: No 3895 dated 19th November 1872.

To

The Secretary to Govt
P. W. D.
Madras

P. W. 5952/72.

2. Petitions from Asst: Taluq Overseer P. Perumal Naidoo dated 3rd July 1872.

Extract from the Administration Report of Madura Range for 1871-72.

80

* * * * * * *

I greatly regret the constant changes that have taken place among the whole of the subordinates in the Range during the year.

The Cheyloor Taluq has a right good Taluq Overseer in charge & his character is well known to the Superintending Engineer & I only wish a few more of his stamp can be imported into the service.

Tiroomungalam Taluq has had 3 changes during the year. Permanent Gurdie the present Overseer on first appointment I was not much pleased with, but it gives me much pleasure now in stating that he is working admirably.

Madura Taluq has had 3 changes during the year.

Shoothoosowmy

shoot to do away for ever the present
Irrig Overseer upholds the character
given him in last administration
report.

The Sub Division has
had 3 changes in the years chosen
Supt Jeffery has only recently
joined the Sub Division, he ap-
pears to have worked hard, but
I must state he has more to
superintend, & single handed than
any mortal man can do.

Shadura [signed] G. R. Leggatt Asst to Engr
11th April 1872. In charge of Shadura Range

True Copy
Rd. Leggatt Asst Engr
Shadura Range

1/3765/1

Extract from the
Administration Report
of Madura Range for
1871-1872

Enclosure 9 in a
letter from the Supt.
Supg. Engineer 5th Division
No 3895 dated 19th Novem
-ber 1872.

To

The Secretary to Govt
P.W.D
Madras

P.W. 5952/72.

Extract from the
Administration Report
of Madura Range for
1871-72

Rec'd Dec 7 72 L Bk 498

Statement given by Gopaul Iyer Head Accountant
Madura Range Office.

x I don't remember the date.

On March 6 P.M. on Saturday the x of April 1872 or two days previous to the enquiry held by the Superintending Engineer & Division ing Personally Said as case, the Native on the way home from the Superintending Engineers bungalow came and told me that he wanted to speak to me privately about something and took me to aside. He then stated that he explained the whole of the circumstances regarding the Police barracks to the Supt. Engineer and told him what Mootheeswamy Pillay reported regarding the footnote entered in the Statements of the above work was untrue and that he could prove that the footnote was entered with the consent of the Pillay. The Superintending Engineer promised to enquire into the matter on monday next. I observed that it is all right.

right. He then stated that I should do him a favor - I asked him what it was. he said that he will cite me as a witness to prove that the Pitlay asked him to insert the footnote in my presence. & that I should confirm his statement when questioned by the Superintending Engr. I answered that I cannot comply with his request since such as they did not transpire; he came again to inform me that I should however as per his request this time and went away.

On Sunday the x of April 1872 the Superintending Engr sent for me and asked me whether I knew any thing about the matter whether Ross Rosemary Pitlay asked the Naidu to insert the footnote in my presence. I answered that one day on their return from the Range Officers bungalow both the Queries came to my quarters and told me they went to see the Range Officer but he was not at home. I asked them whether the Madura Tales had been entirely made over they told

x I don't remember the date

told me they have done with all except the Police barracks for which they are preparing a statement, but regarding the footnote there was no conversation nor do I know any thing about it. Afterwards Peroomaul Naidu turn round and told the Superintending Engineer in the presence of the Range Officer, and the Manager of the Supply Engrs Office & Division, that when he saw me the other day, I promised to depose in his favor, and that I am now telling lies denying all knowledge of it.

I then told the Superintending Engr how the Naidu came to me and prefered me to give false evidence in his favor. His own statement to the Superintending Engr referred to in the preceding paragraph will prove whether such a thing was proposed or not.

Madura
28th October 72

G. Spaulding Head Asstt.
Madura Range Office.

Encls: No. 10 in a
letter from the Supt.
Engineer S. Dt. No 3895
dated 19th November/72

To

The Secretary to Govt.
P.W.D
Madras

P. W. 5952/72.

Statement given by
Gopaul Iyer Head
Accountant of the
Madura Range Offic

No 4782

Recd. 20 Dec 1872 L. B. 15,482

P.W. Dept

No 3040

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Under date the December 1872.

Read the following

From the Supt Engineer
8th Dt (Rec'd under No 3201 of 11th Oct 1872)

From Do — Do
8th Dt (Rec'd under No 3895 of 19th Nov 1872)

His Excellency
the Governor in Council
would not feel justified
in over ruling the
decision of the Super-
intending Engineer
in Provincial Naidu's
case, Head Officer hav-
ing after due consider-
ation re-iterated his
opinion

Nos 5952-5014

Govt. of {1872} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The District Engineer

Madura

Dated

Recd. Encl.

G. O. 20 Dec 1872. No 304

Nos. 1178-1178A

479

Perennial Caidas, Lake

Overseer, Madura District.

Referring to your rule the

services of the Inspecting Perennial

Caidas:

To

The Dt Engr, Madura

Dated 23/12/72

forwarded that the petitioner is quite unfit for the post of Taloor Overseer, and so untrustworthy as not to be deserving of re-employment in any lower capacity.

[illegible]