

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
1st November, 1875.

No 21. Read the following letter from Major J. BEATTY, R E, Acting Superintending Engineer, Godavery, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R E, Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Camp at Alamur, 7th October 1875, No 2,068 —

I HAVE the honor to report on the petition of Jullee Chettigadu, No 1,695,* dated 22nd July 1875, on which orders were
* The number apparently given to the petition in the Government Office passed in Proceedings of Government of 30th August 1875.

2 Jullee Chettigadu was a Lock Lascar at Bobberlunka Lock from 1868 to 1875. The Lock Superintendent Muniswami having had to report him two or three times in 1873 and beginning of 1874 to Captain Brockman for drunkenness, disobedience, and neglect of duty, he was removed by that officer in February last to Dowlaishweram Lock

3 Soon after his removal to Dowlaishweram, Captain Brockman and Mr Ellis received petitions to the same effect, purporting to come from the same parties, certain dhonymen of a dhony specified by number, and stating that Lock Superintendent Muniswami had taken a bribe from them

4. Both Range Officers inquired into the case, and the supposed petitioners stated that they had not given a bribe or been asked for one, but that the petitions had probably been sent by Jullee Chettigadu, as he had told them he would send in such petitions Jullee Chettigadu was thereupon (16th March) suspended for sending false and vexatious petitions against his former Lock Superintendent.

5 As he had already been removed to Dowlaishweram, there was no reason that he should any longer occupy the lock shed at Bobberlunka which he had been permitted to live in while employed there as a Lascar The Anicut Superintendent, therefore, ordered him to leave that shed, and, as he did not do so within a reasonable time, Captain Brockman on 4th June dismissed him His statements as to the cause of his suspension and dismissal are thus shown to be false

6. The petitioner also states in his petition that Mr Assistant Engineer Martin and Overseer Harris refused a bid of 3,000 Rupees made by the Perraveram ryots, at the sale of the Pitchikalunka in 1873, and that the lunka was sold at a loss to Government. The range accounts show that this is also false, and that the Pitchikalunka was purchased by the Perraveram ryots in 1873 for 6,000 Rupees.

7. The next statement in the petition to Government is that, at the sale of 1874 Pitchikalunka was sold by D. Ramannah (the Anicut Superintendent) for 1,100 Rupees, although the Perraveram ryots offered 3,000 Rupees, and that Ramannah had been bribed not to accept the offer of the people of Perraveram.

8. The accounts of the range show that the lunka was sold in 1874 for 1,250 Rupees to the ryots of Kadyapalunka, and on inquiry of the Perraveram ryots about this they explained that, as they had met with a heavy loss by purchasing the lunka in 1873 for 6,000 Rupees, they did not attend the sale in 1874, made no bid, and, as the fact of their loss was generally known, the low price obtained in 1874 is sufficiently accounted for. They know nothing about the bribe said to have been given, and never even heard of it.

Camp Alamiir 7th October 1875

From,
Major J Beatty R.E.
Superintending Engineer Godav.
To,
Major General G.W. Walker R.E.
Secretary to Government. D.P.W.
Madras.

Sir,
I have the honor to report on the petition
of Jullee Chettigadu, No 1695, dated 22nd July 1875
on which orders were passed in Proceedings of Govern-
ment of 30th August 1875.
1. Jullee Chettigadu was a Lock Lascar at
Bobberlunka lock from 1868 to 1875. The Lock
Superintendent Muniswami having had to report
him two or three times in 1873 and beginning of
1874 to Captain Brockman for drunkenness, disobe-
dience and neglect of duty, he was removed by that
officer in February last to Dowlaishweram Lock.
2. Soon after his removal to Dowlaishweram
Captain Brockman and Mr Ellis received petition
to the same effect, purporting to come from the
same parties, certain dhoney men of a dhoney
specified by number, and stating that Lock
Superintendent

* The number
apparently
given to the
petition in the
Government
Office -

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
1st November 1875.

9 The petitioner referred me most confidently to certain inhabitants of Perraveram for information about the bribe, giving me the names of seven persons including the Curnam of the village. These men all declared they knew nothing about it. Some of them knew the man Chettigadu by sight, but he was no friend of theirs and they knew nothing of his story. They gave me particulars of the sales of the lunka, which agreed with the range accounts.

10 The next statement in the petition is that the petitioner was asked for 20 Rupees for D Ramannah by the Lock Superintendent, with the promise that he would then be reinstated in his post of Lock Lascar.

When I asked Jullee Chettigadu about this he declared he knew nothing about it, and that the petition-writer had put it into the petition without his knowledge.

11 But he volunteered a new story of a bribe of 20 Rupees which he was asked to give, not for or to Ramannah, but to the brother of the Lock Superintendent on this brother's marriage. He referred me to two witnesses, who both declared they knew nothing of that case, had never heard of it, and did not know Chettigadu.

12 When I asked Chettigadu if he had sent in that petition to Government, and if that was his mark at the end of it, he said it was not, but that his son had done it. His son, a youth of about fifteen years of age, then came forward, and acknowledged having paid 8 Annas to a petition-writer in Rajahmundry, who prepared it for him. There can be little doubt that this also is a lie, and that Jullee Chettigadu, finding his statements inquired into and knowing them to be false, thought it safer to throw the blame on his son.

13 My head writer recognizes the hand writing of the petition as that of an East Indian named Tishera or Texieraon, who is usually to be found about Dowlaishweram and Rajahmundry, and earns his livelihood by writing petitions.

No 22 ORDER THEREON, 1st November 1875, No 3,096.

ESTABLISHMENT, No 3

The re-employment of Jullee Chettigadu, late a Lock Lascar in the Godavery Delta, in any position in the Government

service or in connection with Government work, is prohibited

(True Extract)

Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, Godavery
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Ed. E C Shumler.
Spare Copies

Superintendent Muniswami had taken a bribe from them.

Both Range officers enquired into the case, and the supposed petitioners stated that they had not given a bribe or been asked for one, but that the petitions had probably been sent by Iullee Chettigadu as he had told them he would send in such petitions. Iullee Chettigadu was thereupon (16th March) suspended for sending false and vexatious petitions against his former Lock Superintendent.

As he had already been removed to Dowrishwaram, there was no reason that he should any longer occupy the lock shed at Bobberilunka which he had been permitted to live in while employed there as a lascar. The Amnicut Superintendent therefore ordered him to leave the shed; and as he did not do so within a reasonable time, Captain Brockman, on 4th June, missed him. His statements as to the cause of his suspension and dismissal are thus shown to be false.

The petitioner also states in his petition that

7th that Mr. Assistant Engineer Martin and Overseer Harris refused a bid of 3,000 Rupees made by the Perraveram ryots, at the sale of the Pitchikalunka in 1873, and that the lunka was sold at a loss to Government. The Range accounts show that this is also false, and that the Pitchikalunka was purchased by the Perraveram ryots in 1873 for 6,000 Rupees.

7. The next statement in the petition to Government is that, at the sale of 1874 (conducted by the Amnicut Superintendent under orders from Captain Brockman) the Pitchikalunka was sold by D. Ramannah (the Amnicut Superintendent) for 1,100 Rupees, although the Perraveram ryots offered 3,000 Rupees, and that Ramannah had been bribed not to accept the offer of the people of Perraveram.

8. The accounts of the Range show that the lunka was sold in 1874 for 1,250 Rupees to the ryots of Kadyapalunka, and on enquiry of the Perraveram ryots about this they explained that, as they had met with a heavy loss by purchasing the lunka in 1873 for 6,000 Rupees, they

they did not attend the sale in 1874, made no bid, and as the fact of their loss was generally known, the low price obtained in 1874 is sufficiently accounted for. They know nothing about the bribe said to have been given, and never even heard of it.

7. The petitioner referred me most confidently to certain inhabitants of Perraveram for information about the bribe, giving me the names of seven persons including the Karanam of the village. These men all declared they knew nothing about it. Some of them knew the man Chettigadu by sight, but he was no friend of theirs and they knew nothing of his story. They gave me particulars of the sales of the lunka which agreed with the Range accounts.

10. The next statement in the petition is that the petitioner was asked for 20 Rupees for D. Ramannah by the Lock Superintendent, with the promise that he would then be reinstated in his post of lock lascar. When I asked Illucol

he declared he knew nothing about it, and that the petitioner had put it into the petition without his knowledge. But he volunteered a new story of a bribe of 20 Rupees which he was asked to give, not for or to Ramannah, but to the brother of the Lock Superintendent, on this brother's marriage. He referred me to two witnesses, who both declared they knew nothing of that case, had never heard of it, and did not know Chettigadu.

12. When I asked Chettigadu if he had sent in that petition to Government, and if that was his mark at the end of it, he said it was not, but that his son had done it. His son, a youth of about 15 years of age, then came forward, and acknowledged having paid eight annas to a petitioner writer in Rajahmundry who prepared it for him. There can be little doubt that this also is a lie, and that Illucol Chettigadu, finding his statements enquired into and knowing them to be false, thought it safer to throw the blame on his son.

13. My head writer recognises the handwriting

writing of the petition as that of an East
Indian named Tishera or Texiraon, who is
usually to be found about Dowlaishweram
and Rajahmundry and earns his liveli-
hood by writing petitions.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most obedient Servt.

J. Beatty Major R.E.

As Supr Engineer Godavery Dt.

rejection

2

m.

18/12/1913

No: 9253

100 2090
 Pabharthi Akshat
 Proceedings of the Madras Government
 Under date the 1st Nov 75
 Read the following:-

From
 The Asst. Engineer
 Godavery } (MS No 2068 dt 7 Oct 75)

The re-employment of
 Jullia C. Pettigada, late a
 Loch Cessa in the Godavari
 Galla, in any position in
 the Government service or
 in connection with Govern-
 ment work, is prohibited.

by 23/10
 G.H.K.

40
 To The Asst. Engineer Godavery
 Chief Engineer for Irrigation
 Controller of P.W. Accounts
 Sh 1/4
 Inspd - 10-11-75

#21695871875

S. W. 1875 Bahr.
 From No: 6523
 The Asst. Engineer
 Godavery Dt
 To the Secretary to Govt
 S.W.M.

Dated 7th October 75
 Recd 14
 No 2068

Reporting on the
 petition of the dis-
 missed lock labourer,
 Jullie Chettigadu

28-10-75
 21-10-75
 G.O. No 3096 - 1-11-75

1543
 Govt. of Madras.
 PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Supg. Engr.
 Godavery.

D. 3

Amount

R. 1

P. 1

G. O. 15/10/1873, No. 3274

Page 21 - 22

Under Contract. Late work.
 Sugar, Godavery Dist - Engr.
 the employment of — in
 any position in Port Service,
 prohibited.

19
 17
 36