

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
12th August 1875.*

No. 208. Read the following letter from Colonel E. A. FOORD, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Bellary, to Lieutenant-Colonel J. MULLINS, R.E., Officiating Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Camp at Gadiganur, 24th July 1875, No. 773 :—

I HAVE the honor to inform you that on the 21st May, the Supervisor in charge of the Pennacondah Range reported that in the Progress Report of the road from Calliandroog to Amarapoor, forwarded by Overseer Dighton, a charge of Rs. 193-14-8 was made for 37,232 square yards removing stones from the road, being at the rate of 1 Pie per square yard. The Supervisor measured the heaps of stones that had been removed, and found they amounted to 50 cubic yards, which would give a rate of Rupees 3-12-0 per cubic yard to make up the amount entered in the Progress Report. The Supervisor also ascertained by actual trial that 39 square yards could be cleared for 1 Pie, instead of only one yard for 1 Pie. It is not likely that coolies working in their usual way would do as much work as the one cooly working in the presence of the Range Officer, but allowing this it is still evident that a gross overpayment was made.

2. Overseer Dighton had been transferred to the Ghooty Range before the road was inspected by the Range Officer of Pennacondah. He was called on for a written explanation of the overpayment. This is given in his letter of the 10th of June, which I enclose. I then received a second letter from the Range Officer (also enclosed), from which it appears that Overseer Dighton did not merely neglect to measure the work before paying for it, but that he made a fraudulent entry in his accounts, and persuaded the Local Fund Sub-Overseer to alter his diaries to make them correspond with the rolls and Maistry's diaries and to support the entry in the Progress Report.

3. I then called on Overseer Dighton to state whether it was true that he had returned some diaries of a Local Fund Sub-Overseer to be altered to agree with a Maistry's diaries and accounts. He sent no direct answer, but applied for certain documents to enable him to prepare his defence against the charges brought against him by the Range Officer. Now, my letter contained no charges brought against him by the Range Officer but only a simple question. On being a second time called on for an answer, he stated that to the best of his knowledge he had not given any of the Sub-Overseer's diaries to the Maistry to get them altered.

4. I cannot accept his denial, for I do not believe the Sub-Overseer and Maistry would have made the statements they have made regarding the diaries unless they were true. They had no object in getting the Overseer into trouble. If Overseer Dighton had been guilty of only negligence I should have disposed of the case by reducing him to a lower grade, but as I believe him to have been guilty of a deliberate fraud, I do not think he is fit to remain in the department. Besides he has already had one warning. In August 1873 he was reduced from 1st to 2nd grade for charging expenditure on one road to another road, and for passing exorbitant rates to a Contractor. (See Chief Engineer's memorandum, No. 326, of the 28th August 1873.)

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
12th August 1875.

No. 209. ORDER THEREON, 12th August 1875, No. 2,326.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 16.

THE Government, concurring with the Superintending Engineer, Bellary, in considering Mr. Overseer Dighton untrustworthy, direct his dismissal from the Public Works Department.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To all Superintending and District Engineers
To the Controller of Public Works Accounts.
„ Consulting Architect.

No. 773. Supply Engrs Office
Camp Kadigaur
24th July 1875

From The Superintending Engineer
Bellary
To The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honour to inform

Enclosures 3.

1 Letter from
Pennacondah
Range Officer
No. 284 of 18 June
1875.

1 Letter from
Overseer Digh-
ton No. 15 of 10 June
1875.

1 Do do. No. 42.

of 11th July 1875.

you that on the 21st May the Super-
viser in charge of the Pennacondah
Range reported that in the Progress
Report of the road from Callianday
to Amarapur forwarded by Overseer
Dighton a charge of Rupees 193.14-8
was made for 37232 square yards
removing stones from the road being
at the rate of one pie per square

roadside adjacent.

yard. The Supervisor measured the
heaps of stones that had been removed
and found they amounted to fifty cubic
yards which would give a rate of
Rs 3-12- per cubic yard to make
up the amount entered in the Progress
Report. The Supervisor also ascertain-
ed by actual trial that 39 square
yards could be cleared for one pie
instead of only one yard for one pie.
It is not likely that coolies working
in their usual way would do as much
work as the one coolie working in the
presence of the Range Officer,
but allowing this, it is still evident
that a gross overpayment was made.

2. Officer Dighton had been trans-
ferred to the Gooty Range before

the road was inspected by the Range
Officer of Remnandah. He was called
on for a written explanation of the
overpayment. This is given in his
letter of the 10th of June which I enclose.
I then received a second letter from
the Range Officer (also enclosed)
from which it appears that Officer
Dighton did not merely neglect to
measure the work before paying for
it, but that he made a fraudulent
entry in his accounts, and persuaded
the Local Fund Sub Overseer to
alter his returns to make them cor-
respond with the rolls and Maistur's
returns and to support the entry in
the Progress Reports.

3. I then called on Officer Dighton
to state whether it was true that he

12
Pun.
Ran.
11.2
1875
12
Over-
ten
Sur
1-50
of 11.

had returned some Diaries of a local
Ind Sub Overseer to be altered to agree
with a Maistry's Diaries and accounts.
He sent no direct answer but applied
for certain documents to enable him
to prepare his defence against the
charges brought against him by
the Range Officer. Now my letter
contained no charges brought against
him by the Range Officer but only
a simple question. On being a second
time called on for an answer he stat-
ed that to the best of his knowledge he
had not given any of the Sub Overseers
Diaries to the Maistry to get them alter-
ed

4 I cannot accept his denial for
I don't believe the Sub Overseer and
Maistry would have made the

statements they have made regard-
ing the Diaries unless they were true.
They had no object in getting the Over-
seer into trouble. If Overseer Dighton
had been guilty of only negligence I
should have disposed of the case by
reducing him to a lower grade but
as I believe him to have been guilty
of a deliberate fraud I do not think
he is fit to remain in the Depart-
ment. Besides he has already had
one warning. In August 1873
he was reduced from 1st to 2^d grade
for charging expenditure on one road
to another road and for passing exor-
bitant rates to a Contractor (see Chief
Engineer's Memo No 326 of the 28th Aug.
1873).

I have seen
E A and Col M. E.
Superintending Engineer
Belgaum.

No 2326 P.M. A. Chav
 Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
 Under date 12th Aug/75
 Read the following:-

From the Super. Insp., Bellary (H.R. No 773 of 24th July/75)

& sent to the Government
 under S.O. - 22/10/75

The Government
 Concurring with the Super.
 Inspector, Bellary, in con-
 sidering Mr. Overseer Dighton
 untrustworthy, direct his
 dismissal from the P.M.
 Dept.

by 9/8

Full supply of Insp. } 135
 Cont. M. A. C. — 12
 Cont. Architect — 3

50 Inspd - 27-8-75

Memorandum No 326 of 26 Aug/75 with
 E. No 4691

P. M. 1895- Dept.
 No 4894

The Insp. Insp.
 Bellary

The Chief Engineer
 P. M. D.

Recd. 29 July 75-8
 P. M. D.

12/7/75
 P. M. D.

Temporary Account kept
 in connection with from
 Committee by Mr. D. M.
 D. M. & recommended
 up his statement.

GS - 142326 of 12 Aug/75

4894

Gobt. of (1875) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Mr. Higgins.

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 12th Aug; 1875, No. 2326

No. 208 - 209

Mr. Overseer Dighton.

Concurring with the Super.
Engr., Bellary, in considering
— untrustworthy &
directing his dismissal
from the P. W. D.