

(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.	624-	Press
B.P. No.	(9/4)	Mis.
208-209		
Dated	9. 3-18/4	195.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th March 1874.*

No. 208. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 17th January 1874, No. 37 :—

I HAVE the honour to lay before His Excellency the Governor in Council certain letters,* as per margin, from the Agent of the Madras Railway Company, reporting the circumstances connected with an accident which occurred on the Ballypully Ghaut upon the 22nd November 1873.

2. A train leaves Tripputty daily at 7-30 A.M. It runs no further than Codoor, the object being to carry over the Ballypully Ghaut any goods wagons which the northward trains are obliged to leave at Tripputty, owing to the number of vehicles being limited upon the ghaut. The train in question is timed to reach Codoor at 9 A.M. It returns at 9-20 A.M., arriving at Tripputty at 10-50 A.M.

3. Upon the 22nd November this train consisted of an engine, tender, thirteen goods wagons, and two brake-vans. The Company's servants with the train were a driver, two firemen, a head porter acting as chief guard, and a porter acting as under guard. There was one passenger in the train, travelling in the chief guard's brake-van. It is explained that this man is one of the Company's fuel contractors, who has a pass permitting him to travel by this train. It is above explained that the train is away from Tripputty between 7-30 A.M. and 10-50 A.M. and as no train is timed to arrive at or depart from Tripputty in the interval, it has been arranged, on the score of economy, that the duties of chief guard and under guard should be performed by the head porter at Tripputty and by one of his subordinates. This arrangement has been in force for some time.

4. Upon reaching the Ballypully Ghaut the driver found that, owing to the slippery state of the rails, the engine could not take the whole train up the incline in one load. He accordingly communicated with the guard, requesting him to divide the train. It was arranged that six wagons and one brake-van should go up in advance, leaving seven wagons and one brake-van to follow. There is some doubt as to how the communication between the driver and the guard was made ; but it seems clear that the guards understood what was to be done, and that the train was actually divided by one or other of them does not admit of a doubt.

5. The rules for the guidance of drivers and guards, when it is found necessary to divide trains in ascending steep inclines, are printed in the Proceedings* of Government, dated the 12th June 1873, No. 932, and were published† in the *Fort Saint George Gazette*. Clause 6 of

† Dated 1st July 1873, page 1,095. these Rules lays down that "before detaching the engine both before ascending the ghaut and on arrival at the top, the chief guard must be very careful to secure his vehicles by screwing down his own brake, and must see that all van and carriage brakes are screwed down and all wagon brakes pinned down *tight*, in order to prevent any risk of there running back when the engine is uncoupled." There can be no doubt that this duty was neglected by the chief guard. He asserts, in his defence, that he screwed down his

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th March 1874.*

own brake, and that it was unscrewed by the passenger in his van; but there seems to be no proof whatever of this, and it is, to say the least, extremely improbable. However this may be, it is proved conclusively that he omitted to pin down the brakes of the wagons. The consequence of this neglect of duty was that, upon the front part of the train being uncoupled, the rear part moved down the ghaut, and ran back to Tripputty, a distance of some 12 miles, without a guard or any one in it. At a distance of about 1½ miles from Tripputty station the runaway vehicles ran into a truck loaded with chunam, the wheels of which got locked in the brake gear of the rear van, the collision causing some slight damage to the truck. Upon the runaway vehicles reaching Tripputty station they were arrested, when it was found that the brake of only one wagon was down, and that the brake in the guard's van was unscrewed.

6. The accident might have been attended with serious consequences, but most fortunately no injury to life or limb has resulted from it, and the damage caused to the Company's property is very slight.

7. The evidence available regarding the circumstances attending the accident was inconclusive and contradictory; and as the Railway Authorities determined to prosecute the chief guard, I delayed this report in the hope that evidence of a more satisfactory nature might be elicited at the trial. The enclosed correspondence will show that Cassim Beg, the servant in question, was tried at Cuddapah by the Head Assistant Magistrate and sentenced to three months' rigorous imprisonment under Section 28 of Act XVIII. of 1854. From the Traffic Manager's letter, dated the 7th instant, forwarded by the Agent, it will be seen that the Magistrate assigned three reasons for inflicting a comparatively light punishment:—

- (1.)—Because the prosecution had failed to prove that a copy of the "Rules for dividing trains" had been furnished to Cassim Beg.
- (2.)—Because, in his opinion, the Station Master had failed in his duty in not sending a travelling porter with the train.
- (3.)—Because the engineman of the train did not "communicate" with the guard in the sense required by the rules.

8. As regards the first point, Mr. Church explains the circumstances under which the Company were unable to prove conclusively the receipt of the rules by accused. The working time tables issued upon the 31st August 1873 and the 1st December 1873 are herewith submitted. It will be seen that at page 35 of the latter it is stated that "the whole of the rules and instructions, printed at page 36 to 120 of the working time-table, dated 31st August 1873, though not reprinted in the working time-table dated 1st December 1873, are still in force."

9. As regards the second point, the Traffic Manager is of opinion that the chief guard was responsible for the presence of a travelling porter in the train, as required by Clause 3 of the Rules. The Agent states that he is inclined to agree with the Magistrate in holding the Station Master at Tripputty responsible. The subject was discussed at a meeting held yesterday, and it was determined to alter Clause 3, and to make the Station Master and guard severally responsible for the presence of a travelling porter in every train ascending any one of the specified ghauts. This amplification of the rule seems necessary.

10. As regards the third point, it seems to me beyond all doubt that the driver did communicate with the guard on the occasion in question in the sense

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th March 1874.*

required by the rules. As however the contrary view was taken by the Magistrate, it was determined at the meeting held yesterday that Clause 4 of the Rules should be modified, so as to state distinctly the respective duties of the driver and of the chief guard upon such occasions. The altered rules shall be laid before Government in the course of a day or two.

11. There can be no doubt that this accident was due to neglect on the part of Cassim Beg, the officiating chief guard, to perform the duties assigned to him in the rules. Although the prosecution were unfortunately unable to bring legal proof that he had been furnished with a copy of the rules, I am satisfied that a copy was duly received by him. In performing the duties assigned to him he should have been assisted by the travelling porter, who ought to have accompanied the train; but that man's absence does not in any way relieve the chief guard from responsibility for the non-performance of those duties. There is some doubt as to whether the chief guard or the Station Master can be held directly answerable for the absence of the travelling porter; but there can be no doubt that, before the departure of the train from Tripputty, it was the duty of the chief guard to ascertain that the train was properly equipped, and to report any defect to the Station Master. And after he had allowed the train to proceed on its journey without the full complement of servants, there can be no doubt that it was his duty to see personally that his own brake was screwed down, and that every wagon brake was pinned down tight, before the engine and the front vehicles were detached.

From the Locomotive Superintendent, to W. B. WRIGHT, Esq., Acting Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Royapooram, 24th November 1873, No. 338.
Portion of 7-30 A.M. Codoor Train of 22nd November returning to Tripputty without engine.
I beg to forward, for your information, the attached copy of a report received from the Locomotive Foreman at Tripputty, No. 725, dated 23rd instant.

From Mr. C. KING, to the Locomotive Superintendent, dated Tripputty, 23rd November 1873, No. 725.

I REGRET to report, for your information, that the driver working the 7-30 A.M. Codoor Train of yesterday was unable to ascend the Ballypully Ghaut with his full train, and the guard, therefore, unhooked the front brake-van and five wagons for the purpose of parting the train; when it appears that upon the guard making some motion to porter to take the front van brake off, a passenger, who was in the rear brake-van, unscrewed the brake, and there being only one wagon brake down, the latter portion of the train, consisting of eight wagons and one brake-van, returned to Tripputty without a guard or any one in the train. When it arrived at Tripputty only one wagon brake was down and the van brake quite off. On the way down at 85-15 mile it ran into a heavy trolley loaded with chunam; the wheels of the latter got locked in the brake gear of the van and caused some little damage to the framing and bearing of the trolley, also to the stays and brake gearing of the van and one pair of wheels were put slightly out of gauge.

No. 971.

FORWARDED to the Consulting Engineer for Railways for information. Further particulars will be forwarded as early as possible.

MADRAS,
25th November 1873.

(Signed) J. W. MELLIS,
for Acting Agent and Manager.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th March 1874*

From W. B. WRIGHT, Esq., Acting Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 2nd December 1873, No. 991.

IN continuation of my endorsement No. 971, dated the 25th ultimo, I have the honour to report, for the information of Government, that the circumstances attending the accident that occurred on the Ballypully Ghaut on the 22nd idem have now been fully inquired into, and the result, I regret to say, shows that the breaking away of the rear part of the train is without doubt to be attributed to a gross violation, on the part of the Company's servants, of the rules framed for dividing trains in ascending ghauts, sanctioned by your letter, No. 678, of the 28th of July 1873.

2. The train in question when it left the Tripetty station consisted of an engine, tender, and fifteen vehicles, including two brake-vans. The servants accompanying it were a driver, two firemen, a head porter, acting as chief guard, and a porter acting as under guard. On reaching the Ballypully Ghaut the driver found that owing to the slippery state of the rails he was unable to take the whole train up the incline in one load, and he accordingly requested the guard to divide the train. This it was arranged to do, and that the first part should consist of six wagons and the under guard's brake-van, and the rear part of seven wagons and the chief guard's brake-van.

3. No. 6 of the Rules which I have mentioned above, in referring to the rear portion of a train which it has been decided to divide, contains the following provision:—"Before detaching the engine both before ascending the ghaut and on arrival at the top, the chief guard must be very careful to secure his vehicles by screwing down his own brake, and must see that all van and any risk of their running back when the engine is uncoupled." The precaution here pointed out the chief guard omitted to take, and the consequence was that as soon as the engine and forepart of the train were detached, the rear part began to move and, as before reported, ran back to Tripetty, before reaching which it came into collision with a material truck loaded with pounded chunam.

4. The under guard who should have accompanied the first part of the train up the ghaut stayed behind when he saw the eight vehicles begin to move, as he says, in order that he might assist the chief guard in putting down the brakes. As usual in these cases the evidence as to the actual number of brakes in the runaway part of the train which were put down is conflicting. The chief guard states that he screwed down the brake in his van before he got out, and that a passenger who was in the van unscrewed it. The passenger however distinctly denies that he touched the brake. The under guard states that after the vehicles began to run back he put down two of the wagon brakes and the chief guard another, while the evidence shows that on arrival at Tripetty only one wagon brake was down, and that the brake in the van was "off."

5. It is very clear however that none of the wagon brakes were let down before the engine was detached, and that when some of them were let down they were not pinned down, so that even admitting that the chief guard screwed down and secured his own brake before leaving his van he must still be held guilty of gross neglect and disobedience of the rules. The name of the man is Cassim Beg, and he has been in the service of the Company for many years. I have instructed the Traffic Manager to have him prosecuted, and will report the result in due course.

6. The rules alluded to also provide (No. 3) that every train working up the Ballypully Ghaut "shall be accompanied by a travelling porter in addition to the regular guards of the train." In this case no travelling porter went with the train, and the Traffic Manager informs me that he has called upon the Station Master at Tripetty to explain why. As far as I am able to judge at present, I think that the Station Master should be prosecuted too, and I have written to Mr. Church upon the subject.

7. As regards the first part of Rule No. 2 (viz., "No train, nor part of a train, must ascend a ghaut without a brake-van attached as the last vehicle thereof and a guard in charge"), which was also broken on this occasion, I think that under the explanation given by the under guard blame can scarcely be attached to him.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th March 1874.*

8. In my letter to the Traffic Manager, I have called his attention to the fact that a passenger was allowed to ride in the brake-van, a thing which I consider should not be allowed under any circumstances except with special permission.

9. The only damage done was to the wood-work of the truck loaded with chunam. The line was examined and gauged immediately after the collision, and found to be in good order.

From R. B. ELWIN, Esq., Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. H. M. SHAW-STEWART, R.E., Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated Madras, 9th January 1874, No. 15.

IN continuation of this Office letter No. 991, dated the 2nd ultimo, I have the honour to enclose you a copy of the Traffic Manager's letter, No. C/8,619-1,597, of the 7th instant, in which it is reported that Cassim Beg, the head porter of Tripetty, who was in charge of the 7-30 A.M. goods train from Tripetty to Codoor on the 22nd of November last, was tried at Cuddapah by the Head Assistant Magistrate and was sentenced to three months' rigorous imprisonment under Section 28 of Act XVIII. of 1854.

2. With reference to the further portion of Mr. Church's letter, I have informed him that I am inclined to agree with the Magistrate in the view which he takes of the conduct of the Station Master at Tripetty. As however the slight alterations which it appears necessary to make in the rules for dividing trains will have to be discussed by heads of departments, I have placed this subject on the agenda for the Committee Meeting to be held on the 16th instant, and you will then be afforded an opportunity of obtaining any further information which you may wish for.

From H. E. CHURCH, Esq., Traffic Manager, to R. B. ELWIN, Esq., Agent and Manager of the Madras Railway Company, dated Madras, 7th January 1874, No. C/8,619-1,597. .
Train breaking loose on Ballypully Ghaut.

IN continuation of my letter No. 8,619-1,597, dated 5th December 1873, I beg to inform you that on Saturday, the 20th December, Cassim Beg, the head porter of Tripetty, who was in charge of the 7-30 A.M. goods train from Tripetty to Codoor on the 22nd November last, was tried at Cuddapah by the Head Assistant Magistrate, and was sentenced to three months' rigorous imprisonment under Section 28 of Act XVIII. of 1854.

2. In delivering judgment Mr. Atkinson observed that a comparatively light punishment would be inflicted—

1st.—Because the prosecution had failed to prove that a copy of the "Rules for dividing trains" had been furnished to Cassim Beg.

2nd.—Because, in his opinion, the Station Master had failed in his duty in not sending a travelling porter with the train.

3rd.—Because the engineman of the train did not "communicate" with the guard about dividing the train in the sense required by the rules.

3. As regards the first point. The Circular embodying the rules for dividing trains was furnished to all Assistant Traffic Managers, to all guards, and to the Station Master of each station with spare copies for all head porters employed under them. At the time this Circular was issued Cassim Beg was doing duty at Royapooram as head porter, and the Station Master of that station states that a copy of the Circular was given to him, but no receipt was taken. The rules were subsequently embodied in the working time-table, dated 31st August, (see page 62), and a copy of this time-table was issued as usual to all concerned, including head porters, but it could not be proved that Cassim Beg had given a receipt for it. The Station Master of Tripetty swore that on the transfer of Cassim Beg from Royapooram to Tripetty, on the 4th October 1873, he (the Station Master) asked him whether he possessed a watch, a time-table, and signals, and was informed by Cassim Beg that he had been supplied with all these essentials at Madras. On the 23rd October, subsequent to this transfer, a revised time-table was introduced, and a copy of the working time-table was given to, and a receipt taken from, Cassim Beg, but in lieu of the

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th March 1874.*

rules, etc., printed in extenso in the working time-table, dated 31st August, the following footnote was inserted in the time-table, dated 23rd October.

"The whole of the rules and instructions printed at pages 36 to 120 of the working time-table, dated 31st August 1873, though not reprinted in the working time-table, dated 23rd October 1873, are still in force."

The reason why the rules were not printed was that after receipt of sanction to the introduction of the time-table, dated 23rd October, it was not considered desirable to postpone the new service longer than was absolutely necessary to print the tables themselves.

4. With regard to the second point. The Station Master's explanation for starting the train without personally examining it is, that he relied on the guard, who signalled to him that the train was ready, and therefore it was supposed complete in every respect. The inference, in my opinion, was a reasonable one, as it seems to me that the guard of the train, and not the Station Master, is the proper person to see that the train is complete, and, failing to make known any deficiency to the Station Master, accepts the sole responsibility. The Station Master has his own duties to perform, and it does not seem to me to be equitable to impose upon him a responsibility which properly attaches to the guard in charge of a train. At the same time, I must admit that the Station Master did not appoint a man to perform the duties of travelling porter in the absence from sickness of one of the two men specially appointed for the Ballypully Ghaut, nor did he report the absence of the sick man.

5. In respect of the third point. Mr. Atkinson considered that, although not specifically stated in the rules, it was obviously intended that the communication between the driver and guard should be a personal one. The head fireman swore that the driver called to the guard, who was standing about a wagon's length from the engine, while the defendant stated that the head fireman came and told him to divide the train. Another witness swore that the head fireman never left the engine, while the porter, working as under guard, swore that the head fireman not only came off the engine but actually unscrewed the brake of the first van, to allow the coupling to be removed from the next wagon where the train was divided. The driver admitted that he did not leave the engine, because he was prohibited from doing so by the rules of the Company, and he adhered to this opinion even after Rule 19 of Section XIII. was pointed out to him by the Magistrate.

6. With regard to the wording of the rules for dividing trains, it seems necessary in clause 3 to fix responsibility, and, in my opinion, the guard in charge of a train is the proper person. In clause 4 the word "personally" before "communicate with the guard" seems desirable.

7. Although the evidence was insufficient to convict Cassim Beg of breaking the rules recently sanctioned for dividing trains, I hope the Government will consider the punishment inflicted by the Magistrate sufficient to deter other members of the staff from violating rules.

No. 209.

ORDER THEREON, 9th March 1874, No. 624.

RAILWAY, No. 25.

WITH his letter above recorded the Consulting Engineer submits correspondence on the subject of an accident at

Ballypully, on the 22nd November 1873, which occurred on dividing a train about to ascend the ghaut.

2. It is observed that owing to the omission on the part of the chief guard to secure, in the manner prescribed by the rules, the brakes of all the vehicles detached, the latter half of the train broke away, and, running down the incline came in collision with a material trolley near the Tripputty Station, causing slight damage to the truck and brake-van of the train, but without injury to life or limb.

3. The chief guard has been judicially tried and sentenced to three months' rigorous imprisonment; the comparative leniency of the sentence being due in some measure to the prosecution having failed to prove that a copy of the rules for

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th March 1874.*

dividing trains had been furnished to him. That satisfactory evidence was not obtained that every person concerned had been furnished with copies of the rules before they were brought into force is much to be regretted, it being distinctly stipulated in G. O., No. 1,827, dated 16th July 1873, that this precaution should be taken. His Excellency in Council hopes that it has now been done.

4. This accident has shown the necessity for slight modification of the rules last sanctioned, in order to define more clearly the duties of the several officers concerned and to fix responsibility, and His Excellency the Governor in Council will await the promised amendments.

5. On the occasion when the accident occurred a head porter was allowed to act as chief guard and a porter as under guard, and this arrangement appears to have been habitually allowed with the daily short train from Tripputty to Codoor and back, on the score of economy. The propriety of the arrangement however seems to His Excellency the Governor in Council to be questionable; and the Consulting Engineer will call on the Railway Authorities to report further on the matter. The responsibility of the Station Master at Tripputty for neglecting to appoint a man to perform the duties of the travelling porter, who is stated to have been absent from sickness which was not even reported, also seems to be viewed by the Company's officers in a less serious light than appears to His Excellency in Council such grave dereliction of duty demands, no notice whatever apparently having been taken of the conduct of this official.

6. A reference to page 23 of the Report of Railway Accidents for 1872 will show that a large proportion of accidents is due to the negligence or mistakes of officers or servants of Railway Companies, and it seems necessary therefore that laxity in the performance of duties affecting the safety of the travelling public should be most strictly guarded against.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,

Secretary to Government.

To the Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Exd S T. Austin.

Spare Copies

Gobt. of 1874 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

THE CONSULTING ENGINEER
FOR RAILWAYS.

Dated March 9th.

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 9th March 1874, No. 624.

MARCH.

Nos. 208-209

Accident, Madras Railway.—Passing orders on papers relating to an accident which occurred on the Ballypally Ghat on the 22nd November 1873.

Railway Department.

CONSULTING ENGINEER'S OFFICE.

No. 37

From

LIEUT. COLONEL J. H. M. SHAW STEWART, R.E.,
Consulting Engineer for Railways,

To

COLONEL G. W. WALKER, R.E.,
Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

I have the honour to lay before His Excellency the Governor in Council certain letters as per margin from the Agent of the Madras Railway Company, reporting the circumstances connected with an accident which occurred on the Ballypally Ghat upon the 22nd November 1873.

A train leaves Tripetty daily at 7-30 a.m. It runs no further than Coobur; the object

being

x No. 991 - 25th November 1873.
991 - 2nd December 1873.
15 - 9th January 1874 with enclosure.

being to carry over the Ballapully
ghaut any goods-wagons which the
northward trains are
obliged to leave at Tripetty, owing
to the number of vehicles being
limited upon the ghaut. The
train in question is timed to
reach Coodeer at 9-0 a.m. It
returns at 9-20 a.m.; arriving at
Tripetty at 10-50 a.m.

3. Upon the 22nd November
this train consisted of an engine,
tender, thirteen goods-wagons, and
two brake-vans. The Company's
servants with the train were a
driver, two firemen, a head porter
acting as chief guard, and a porter
acting as under guard. There was
one passenger in the train,
travelling

2
travelling in the chief guard's brake-
van. It is explained that this
man is one of the Company's fuel
contractors, who has a pass permitting
him to travel by this train. It
is also explained that the train
is away from Tripetty between 7-30
a.m., and 10-50 a.m.; and, as no
train is timed to arrive at or depart
from Tripetty in the interval, it
has been arranged on the score of
economy that the duties of chief
guard and under guard should be
performed by the head porter at
Tripetty and by one of his subordi-
nates. This arrangement has been
in force for some time.

4. Upon reaching the
Ballapully ghaut the driver found
that

be that, owing to the slippery state of
the rails, the engine could not take
the whole train up the incline in
one load. The accordingly com-
municated with the guard, re-
questing him to divide the train.
It was arranged that six wagons
and one brake-van should go
up in advance, leaving seven
wagons and one brake-van to
follow. There is some doubt
as to how the communication
between the driver and the guard
was made; but it seems clear
that the guards understood what
was to be done; and that the
train was actually divided by
one or other of them does not admit
of a doubt.

5. The

* Judicial
Department.

* dated 1st July 1873, No. 932, and were published
1873 - page 1095. in the Port Saint George Gazette.

5. The rules for the guidance
of drivers and guards when it is
found necessary to divide trains
in ascending steep inclines are
printed in the Proceedings* of
Government dated the 12th June
Clause 6 of these rules lays down
that "before detaching the engine
both before ascending the shaft
and on arrival at the top the
Chief Guard must be very careful
to secure his vehicles by screwing
down his own brake, and must
see that all van and carriage
brakes are screwed down and
all wagon brakes pinned down
tight, in order to prevent any risk
of their running back when the

engine

'engine is uncoupled'. There can be no doubt that this duty was neglected by the Chief guard. He asserts in his defence that he screwed down his own brake, and that it was unscrewed by the passenger in his van: but there seems to be no proof whatever of this, and it is to say the least extremely improbable. However this may be, it is proved conclusively that he omitted to screw down the brakes of the wagons. The consequence of this neglect of duty was that, upon the front part of the train being uncoupled, the rear part moved down the gradient, and ran back to Tripetty,

a

4
a distance of some 12 miles, without a guard or any one in it. At a distance of about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Tripetty station the runaway vehicles ran into a truck loaded with dynamite, the wheels of which got locked in the brake gear of the rear van, the collision causing some slight damage to the truck.

Upon the runaway vehicles reaching Tripetty station, they were arrested; when it was found that the brake of only one wagon was down, and that the brake in the guard's van was unscrewed.

The accident might have been attended with serious consequences, but most fortunately no injury to life or limb has resulted from it, and the damage

caused

caused to the Company's property is very slight.

7. The evidence available regarding the circumstances attending the accident was inconclusive and contradictory; and, as the Railway Authorities determined to prosecute the chief guard, I delayed this report in the hope that evidence of a more satisfactory nature might be elicited at the trial. The enclosed correspondence will shew that Cassim Beg, the servant in question, was tried at Ludlowpah by the Head Assistant Magistrate, and sentenced to three months rigorous imprisonment under section 28 of Act XVIII of 1854.

J.P.

5
From the Traffic Manager's letter dated the 7th instant, forwarded by the Agent, it will be seen that the Magistrate assigned three reasons for inflicting a comparatively light punishment:—

(1) Because the provocation had not failed to prove that a copy of the rules for dividing trains had been furnished to Cassim

Beg;—
(2) because, in his opinion, the station-master had failed in his duty in not sending a travelling porter with the train;

(3) because the engineman of the train did not communicate with the guard in the sense required by the rules.

S. S.

8. As regards the first point Mr. Church explains the circumstances under which the Company were unable to prove conclusively the receipt of the rules by the accused. The working time-tables issued upon the 31st of August 1873 and the 1st of December 1873 are herewith submitted. It will be seen that at page 35 of the latter it is stated that the whole of the rules and instructions printed at pages 36 to 120 of the working time-table dated 31st of August 1873, though not reprinted in the working time-table dated 1st December 1873, are still in force.

9. As regards the second point, the Traffic Manager is of

6
of opinion that the chief guard was responsible for the presence of a travelling porter in the train, as required by clause 3 of the rules. The Agent states that he is inclined to agree with the Magistrate in holding the Station-master at Tripetty responsible. The subject was discussed at a meeting held yesterday, and it was determined to alter clause 3, and to make the Station-master and guard severally responsible for the presence of a travelling porter in every train ascending any one of the specified ghats. This amplification of the rule seems necessary.

10. As regards the third point, it seems to me beyond all doubt that the driver did commu-
-nicate

-nicate with the guard on the occasion in question in the sense required by the rules. As however the contrary view was taken by the Magistrate, it was determined at the meeting held yesterday that clause 4 of the rules should be modified so as to state distinctly the respective duties of the driver and of the chief guard upon such occasions. The altered rules shall be laid before Government in the course of a day or two.

11. There can be no doubt that this accident was due to neglect on the part of Cassim Beg, the officiating Chief guard, to perform the duties assigned to him in the rules.

Although the prosecution were un-

-fortunately

-fortunately unable to bring legal proof that he had been furnished with a copy of the rules, I am satisfied that a copy was duly received by him. In performing the duties assigned to him he should have been assisted by the travelling porter who ought to have accompanied the train, but that man's absence does not in any way relieve the Chief guard from responsibility for the non-performance of those duties. There is some doubt as to whether the Chief guard or the station-master can be held directly answerable for the absence of the travelling porter; but there can be no doubt that, before the departure of the train from Tripetty, it was the duty of the chief guard to ascertain that the train was properly equipped, and to report any defect to the station-master. And, after he had

allowed

To
 The Secretary to Government,
 F. W. Department,
 Fort Said Victor
 From
 The Consulting Engineer
 Railway Department.
 10437

I regret to report, for your information that the Driver working the 7.30. A M. Cochin Train of yesterday was unable to ascend the Ballapully Ghaut with his full Train and the Guard, therefore, unhooked the front Brake

Van and five Wagons for the purpose of parting
the Train; when it appears that, upon the Guard
making some motion to Porter to take the front
Van Brake off, a passenger, who was in the rear
Brake Van, unscrewed the brake, and there
being only one Wagon brake down, the latter
portion of the Train, consisting of 8 Wagons and
1 Brake Van, returned to Tirupetty without a
guard or any one in the Train. When it
arrived at Tirupetty only one Wagon brake was
down and the Van brake quite off. On the way
down at $\frac{85}{16}$ mile, it ran into a heavy Trolley
loaded with chunam; the wheels of the latter
got locked in the Brake gear of the Van and
caused some little damage to the framing and
bearing of the Trolley, also to the stays and brake
gearing of the Van and one pair of wheels were
put slightly out of gauge.

Yours Obediently
sd/ Charles King

/ True Copy /
sd/ G. F. Mathew
for Locomotive Superintendent
/ True Copies /

J. W. Nellis.
Ag. Agent and Manager

N^o 971.

Forwarded to the Consulting Engineer for Railways
for information. Further particulars will
be forwarded as early as possible.

Madras
25th November }
1873

9.
paint,

619
1597

Madras Railway 14
Traffic Manager's Office
Madras, 7th January 1874

The Agent & Managers
Madras Railway Company

Dear Sir

Train breaking loose on Ballypully Ghaut

In continuation of my letter No 619
dated 5th December 1873, I beg to inform you
that on Saturday the 20th December,
Cassim Beg, the Head Porter of Tirupetty,
who was in charge of the 7.30 am goods
train from Tirupetty to Cuddoor on the
22nd November last, was tried at
Cuddapah by the Head assistant Magis-
trate, and was sentenced to 3 months
rigorous imprisonment under section
28 of Act XXIV of 1854.

2. In delivering judgment Mr.
Atkinson observed that a comparatively
light punishment would be inflicted
1st because the prosecution had failed to
prove that a copy of the "Rules for dividing
Trains" had been furnished to Cassim
Beg.

2. Because, in his opinion, the station
master had failed in his duty in
not sending a Travelling Porter with
the train.

3. Because the Engineman of the train
did not "communicate" with the Guard

25. Nov. 1874
W. J. G. H. H. H. H.
In N. 208.

8. 11. 3. 11. 1874

9.

train

about dividing the Train in the sense required by the Rules.

3. As regards the first point - The Circular embodying the Rules for dividing Trains was furnished to all Assistant Traffic Managers, to all Guards and to the Station Masters of each Station with spare copies for all Head Porters employed under them. At the time this Circular was issued Cassim Beg was doing duty at Royapuram as Head Porter, and the Station Master of that Station states that a copy of the Circular was given to him, but no receipt was taken. The Rules were subsequently embodied in the Working Time Table dated 31st August (see Page 62) and a copy of this Time Table was issued as usual to all concerned including Head Porters, but it could not be proved that Cassim Beg had given a receipt for it. The transfer of Cassim Beg from Royapuram to Tirupetty on the 4th October 1873 he (the Station Master) asked him whether he possessed a watch, a Time Table and signals, and was informed by Cassim Beg that he had been supplied with all these essentials at Madras. On the 23rd October, subsequent to this transfer, a revised Time Table was introduced, and a copy of the Working Time Table

15
was given to, and a receipt taken from, Cassim Beg, but in lieu of the Rules to printed in extenso in the Working Time Table dated 31st August the following foot note was inserted in the Time Table dated 23rd October.

"The whole of the Rules and Instructions printed at pp 36 to 120 of the Working Time Table dated 31st August 1873,

"though not reprinted in the Working

"Time Table dated 23rd October 1873,

"were still in force."

The reason why the Rules were not printed was that after receipt of sanction to the introduction of the Time Table dated 23rd October, it was not considered desirable to postpone the new service longer than was absolutely necessary to print the Tables themselves.

4. With regard to the 2^d point - The Station Master's explanation, for starting the Train without personally examining it, is that he relied on the Guard who signalled to him that the train was ready, and therefore, it was supposed, complete in every respect. The inference, in my opinion, was a reasonable one, as it seems to me that the Guard of the Train, and not the Station Master, is the proper person to see that the Train is complete, and, failing to make known any

deficiency to the station Master, accept the sole responsibility. The station Master has his own duties to perform, and it does not seem to me to be equitable to impose upon him a responsibility which properly attaches to the Guard in charge of a train. At the same time I must admit that the station Master did not appoint a man to perform the duties of travelling Porter in the absence from sickness of one of the 2 men specially appointed for the Ballyhully Grant, nor did he report the absence of the sick man.

5. In respect of the 3rd point - Mr. Atkinson considered that, although not specifically stated in the Rules, it was obviously intended that the communication between the Driver and Guard should be a personal one. The head Fireman swore that the Driver called to the Guard, who was standing about a wagon's length from the Engine, while the Defendant stated that the Head Fireman came and told him to divide the train. Another witness swore that the Head Fireman never left the Engine, while the Porter, working as under Guard, swore that the head Fireman not only came off the Engine but actually unscrewed the brake of the first Van to allow

the coupling to be removed from the next wagon where the train was divided - The Driver admitted that he did not leave the Engine, because he was prohibited from doing so by the Rules of the Company, and he adhered to this opinion even after Rule 19 of section XIII was pointed out to him by the Magistrate.

6. With regard to the wording of the Rules for dividing trains, it seems necessary in clause 3. to fix responsibility, and in my opinion the Guard in charge of a train is the proper person. In clause 4. the word "personally" before "Communicate with the Guard" seems desirable.

7. Although the evidence was insufficient to convict Cassin Beg of breaking the Rules recently sanctioned for dividing trains, should the Government will consider the punishment inflicted by the Magistrate sufficient to deter other members of the staff from violating Rules -

yours Vc
H. E. Church
Traffic Manager

1 True Copy
W. J. Brown
agent. W. J. Brown

CP

No. 991

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGER'S OFFICE.

Madras, 2^d December 1873.

From

W. D. King Esq^r
Agent and Manager. M. R. Co.

To

Edw. J. Hall, Esq^r Stewart, Esq^r
Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Sir,

In continuation of my endorsement of 991, dated the 25th ultimo, I have the honour to report for the information of Government that the circumstances attending the accident that occurred on the Rallipally, Ghaut on the 22^d idem have now been fully inquired into, and the result, I regret to say, shows that the breaking away of the rear part of the train is without doubt to be attributed to a gross violation on the part of the Company's servants of the Rules framed for dividing trains in ascending Ghauts sanctioned by your letter of 678 of the 28th of July 1873.

The train in question when it left the Tripetty station, consisted of an Engine, Tender, and fifteen vehicles including two Brake vans. The servants accompanying it were a

3
P. M. 3/11/74

W. D. King Esq^r
J. H. 208.

drivers, two firemen, a Head Porter acting as Chief Guard, and a Porter acting as underguard. On reaching the Ballypallyphant the Driver found that owing to the slippery state of the rails he was unable to take the whole train up the incline in one load, and he accordingly requested the Guard to divide the train. This it was arranged to do, and that the first part should consist of six waggons and the Under Guard's brake van, and the rear part of seven waggons and the Chief Guard's brake Van.

3. Art. 6 of the Rules which I have mentioned above, in referring to the rear portion of a train which it has been decided to divide, contains the following provision: "Before detaching the Engine both before ascending the Ghaut and on arrival at the top, the Chief Guard must be very careful to secure his Vehicles by screwing down his own brake and must see that all Van and Carriage brakes are screwed down and all Wagon brakes pinned down tight, in order to prevent any risk of their running back when the Engine is uncoupled". The precaution here pointed out the Chief Guard omitted to take, and the consequence was that on

16
soon as the Engine and fore part of the train were detached, the rear part began to move such as before reported, ran back to Vinipetty, before reaching which it came into collision with a material Truck loaded with powdered Charcoal.

4. The Under Guard who should have accompanied the first part of the train up the shaft, stayed behind when he saw the vehicles begin to move, as he says, in order that he might assist the Chief Guard in putting down the brakes. As usual in these cases the evidence as to the actual number of brakes in the run away part of the train which were put down is conflicting - The Chief Guard states that he screwed down the brake in his van before he got out, and that a passenger who was in the Van unscrewed it. The Passenger however distinctly denies that he touched the brake. The Under Guard states that after the vehicles began to run back, he put down two of the waggon brakes, and the Chief Guard another, while the evidence shows that on arrival at Vinipetty only one waggon brake was down, and that the brake in the Van was 'off'.

5. It is very clear however that none of the waggon brakes were let down before the Engine was detached, and that when some of them were let down they were not priced down, so that even admitting that the Chief Guard screwed down and secured his own brake before leaving his Van he must still be held guilty of gross neglect and disobedience of the Rules. The name of the man is Cassim Beg, and he has been in the service of the Company for many years. I have instructed the Traffic Manager to have him prosecuted, and will report the result in due course.

6. The Rules alluded to also provide (213) that every train working up the Bullypully Ghant shall be accompanied by a Travelling Porter in addition to the regular Guards of the Train. In this case no travelling Porter went with the train and the Traffic Manager informs me that he has called upon the Station Master at Tirupetty to explain why. As far as I am able to judge at present I think that the Station Master should be prosecuted too, and I have written to Mr. Church upon the subject.

7. As regards the first part of Rule No 2, (namely, "no train must start without a brake man attached as the last vehicle thereof, and a forward in charge") which was also broken on this occasion. I think that under the explanation given by the Under Forward blame can scarcely be attached to him.

8. In my letter to the Traffic Manager, I have called his attention to the fact that a Passenger was allowed to ride in the Brake Van, a thing which I consider should not be allowed under any circumstances, except with special permission.

9. The only damage done was to the road-work of the Truck loaded with Churnam. The line was examined and gauged immediately after the collision, and found to be in good order.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

J. H. Morris.
Traffic Agent & Manager.

No. 15.

MADRAS RAILWAY.

AGENT AND MANAGERS' OFFICE.

Madras, 9th January 1874.

22

From

R. B. Edwin Esqrd.

Agent and Manager of the M.R.C.

To

Lieut. Col. J. H. Shaw Stewart R.E.

Consulting Engineer for Railways.

Sir,

In continuation of this office letter No. 991 dated the 2nd ultimo, I have the honour to enclose you a copy of the Traffic Manager's letter No. 8619 of the 7th instant, in which it is reported that Cassim Beg the Head Porter of Tumpetty who was in charge of the 7.30 am goods train from Tumpetty to Cuddoor on the 22nd of November last was tried at Cuddalore by the Head Assistant Magistrate and was sentenced to three months rigorous imprisonment under section 28 of Act XVIII of 1854.

2. With reference to the further portion of Mr. Church's letter I have informed him that I am inclined to agree with the Magistrate in the view which he takes of the conduct of the Station Master

MADRAS RAILWAY.

From

The Agent and Manager

To

The Consulting Engineer

for Railways

Dated 5th Dec 1873

No. 991.

Forwarding further for
enclosure to the Secy.
- dont which received it
the 12th by Mr. Shaw
on the 22nd Jan last

1874

1874

at Timbuctoo. As however the slight alterations which it appears necessary to make in the Rules for dividing trains will have to be discussed by Heads of Departments, I have placed this subject on the agenda for the Committee meeting to be held on the 16th instant, and you will then be afforded an opportunity of obtaining any further information which you may wish for.

I have the honour to be
Sir

Your most Obedient servant

W. J. A. Jones

Agent & Manager

624
Public Works Department
Proceedings of the Madras Government
Read the following:-
From: The Consulting Engineer for Railways (H. E. No. 373, 17th Jan 1874)

With his letter above recorded the Consulting Engineer submits for consideration on the subject of an accident at Balleyfully, on the 22nd November 1873, which occurred on dividing a train about to ascend of the Ghaut. It is observed that owing to the omission on the part of the Chief Guard to secure in the manner prescribed by the rules, the breaking of all the vehicles detached, the latter half of the train broke away, and running down

Mr. 2/2
a more Particulars in the
H. E. No. 373, 17th Jan 1874

22

MADRAS RAILWAY.

From

The Agent and Manager.

To

The Consulting Engineer

for Railways.

Dated 9th Decr 1874
Recd. W. M.

Regarding the accident of the passenger train at Balleyfully, the report of the Consulting Engineer for Railways, dated 9th Decr 1874, is received at the Madras Railway Station.

Mr. 371/74
H. E. No. 373, 17th Jan 1874.
H. E. No. 208.

down the incline came
in collision with a
material sholley near
the Tripatty Station
causing slight damage
to the truck and brake
van of the Train, but
without injury to life
or limb.

3. The Chief Guard
has been judicially
tried and sentenced to
three months rigorous
imprisonment, the com-
parative leniency of
the sentence being due
in some measure to
the prosecution having
failed to prove that a
copy of the rules for
dividing trains had
been furnished to him.
That satisfactory evi-
dence was not obtained

tha

It is not known
whether the Chief
Guard was
furnished with a
copy of the rules
for dividing trains
at the time of the
collision.

to be
to Parkes

that every person con-
-cerned had been fur-
-nished with copies of
the rules before they
were brought into
force is much to be
regretted, it being dis-
-tinctly stipulated in
G. O. No. 1827 dated 16th
July 1873 that this pre-
-caution should be
-taken. His Excellency
in Council hopes that
it has now been done.
5 This accident has
shown the necessity
for slight modification
of the rules last sanc-
-tioned in order to
define more clearly
the duties of the several
officers.

188. 79. 14 March 1874.
A. N. 208.

officers concerned and to
fix responsibility, and
His Excellency the Governor
in Council will await
the promised amendments.

4. On the occasion when
the accident occurred a
Head Porter was allowed
to act as Chief Guard
and a Porter as Under
Guard, and this arrange-
ment appears to have
been habitually allowed
with the daily short train
from Tripatty to Godoor
and back, on the score
of economy. The pro-
priety of the arrange-
ment however seems
to His Excellency the Gover-
nor in Council to be
questionable; and the
Consulting Engineer will

~~Not for the Council~~

By rule

will call on the Railway
Authorities to report further
on the matter. The respon-
sibility of the Station
Master at Tripatty for
neglecting to appoint a
man to perform the
duties of the Travelling
Porter who is stated to
have been absent from
sick leave which was not
even reported, also seems
to be viewed by the Com-
missioner in a less serious
light than appears to
His Excellency in Council
such ^{gross} dereliction
of duty demands; no
notice whatever appa-
rently having been
taken of the conduct
of this official.

6. A reference to page
23 of the Report of

Railway accidents for 1873
will show that a large
proportion of accidents
is due to the negligence
or mistakes of officers
or servants of Railway
Companies, and it seems
necessary therefore that
care in the performance
of duties affecting the safety
of the travelling public
should be most strictly
guarded against.

C.M.W.

208-209

7 Jns Engineer
Recd with d. C. 12/3/74.

D.C. 12/74
Cn 30/1/74 A.S. 2-74

371
★
Govt. of 1874 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

The Consulting Engs
for Railways

Date

Recd.

Encl. 6

G. O. 9 March 1874

No. 2083209

Accident in Railway

Passing orders on
papers relating to an
accident which oc-
curred on the Balla-
pelly Ghaut on the
22nd November 1873