

(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.	309A-	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	3-2-	195
		6875

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 3.31

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
3rd February 1875*

Read the following —

No 94 A From the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated 9th April 1874 No. D. —

No 94 B ORDER THEREON, 3rd February 1875, No. 309 A

ESTABLISHMENT, No 3.

A. CUPPUSAWMY MOODELLIAR will be informed that, in the opinion of His Excellency the Governor in Council

after perusal of the report of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, he has signally failed to prove his charges against Mr. Norfor, and has been most deservedly dismissed from the Government service for contumacious and insubordinate conduct such as cannot be tolerated in any department. He will however be permitted another trial as Taluq Overseer, 3rd grade, in any other districts but South Arcot or Salem.

2 His Excellency in Council regrets that Mr. Norfor should have laid himself open to such accusations as those brought against him by his negligence in keeping the departmental accounts of his works, and by mixing up private interests with public transactions.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R E,
Secretary to Government.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" District Engineer, South Arcot.
" Salem
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.
A. Cuppusawmy Moodelliar with Endorsement

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

EXTRACTS from the Service Register of
A CUPPUSAWMY MOODELLIAN

ESTABLISHMENT	Date	Appointment	Salary
1	2	3	4
North Arcot District Engineer's office	From 1st October 1860, to 11th July 1864	1st year 2nd year Apprentice 3d year And portion of 4th year	7 0 0 9 0 0 11 0 0
South Arcot No 4 Range office	From 12th July 1864, to 18th Sept 1867	Draughtsman and Estimator	13 0 0
	From 19th September 1867 to 30th November 1868	Surveyor	40 0 0
	From 1st December 1868, to 19th June 1870	Draughtsman & Estimator	90 0 0
	From 20th June 1870 to 30th June 1872	Taluq Overseer	40 0 0
	From 1st July 1872 to 15th June 1873	Do 2nd Grade	60 0 0
			80 0 0

No 4 Range, South Arcot District
AGE WHEN FIRST ENTERED, 18 YEARS

Period of service in each appointment			REMARKS REGARDING PUNISHMENTS, SEVERE AND FORMAL REPRIMANDS AND ALL SPECIAL COMMENDATIONS OR MARKS OF APPROBATION
Years	Months	Days	
5			6
3	9	11	I have always found A CUPPUSAWMY MOODELLIAN to be a steady, quiet, hard-working man and a neat and careful Draughtsman and Estimator
3	2	7	(Signed) ROSS THOMPSON, Lieut Royal Engineers December 12th 1865
1	2	12	Has investigated three Irrigation Projects while under my orders and proved himself a very efficient Surveyor, Estimate maker and Draughtsman and would make an exceedingly good Taluq Overseer, more especially on large and important works
1	6	19	(Signed) R F NORFOLK, Executive Engineer 20th November, 1868
2	0	10	(True Extract) (Initialed) J M H Assistant Engineer, No 4, Range, S Arcot
0	11	15	7th June, 1872 VIRDACHILLUM

6
PROCEEDINGS of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
20th April, 1870

No 233

Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Cuddalore, 2d April 1870, No 1

I have the honor to request that Government will be pleased to exempt A CUPPISAWMY MUDALIAR, at present Draughtsman and Estimate maker in the 4th Range, South Arcot, from passing the Examination for Taluq Overseer on the following grounds

2 He has been in the Department since October 1860, first as an Apprentice and afterwards as Draughtsman and Estimate maker. From September 1867 to December 1868 he was employed as a Surveyor on 90 Rupees a month, and during that time he prepared, under the Range officer, all the Surveys, sections, plans and estimates connected with the

Mamathur Annicut, estimate	Rs
Pelanduram do do	55 800
Katoomalore do do	1,98,235
Vylore tank (enlargement)	11,000
	6,065

He superintended successfully the building of the Mamathur Annicut, and, as he is also a first-class Draughtsman and Estimate maker, he might be employed most advantageously as Taluq Overseer when there is a vacancy in that grade

No 234

Order thereon, 20th April 1870, No 1,037
Under the very favorable testimony borne in this letter to the qualifications of A. CUPPISAWMY MUDALIAR, His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to exempt him from the prescribed examination for the grade of Taluq Overseer

True Extract
(Signed) CHARLES A ORR, Colonel R F
Secretary to Government

To the Superintending Engineer, 5th Division
" Controller of Public Works Accounts
Exd A S RODGERS

7

No 86

Forwarded for the information of A CUPPISAWMY MUDALIAR, in charge of the Mamathur Annicut works

(Signed) R F NORFOLK,
Executive Engineer

25th April, 1870

Official year 1870-71

A CUPPISAWMY MUDALIAR, makes a very good Overseer and has the advantage over others in the Range from the thorough knowledge he possesses of Surveying, Levelling, and Drawing

(Signed) R F NORFOLK
Executive Engineer

No 57

PONNAR ANNICUT,
16th June, 1872

From J M BELL ESQUIRE,
Assistant Engineer,
No 3 Range, S Arcot

To COLONEL F A FOORD R E
Superintending Engineer,
5th Division

SIR

With reference to your letter No 276 of the 7th instant, para 3, I have the honor to bring to your notice that I shall feel much difficulty in collecting information that I may be in need of in connection with the Pelanduram Mamathur, and Keenanoor Projects to dispose of all the particulars in a creditable manner, in the absence of an able subordinate who has had any connection with these works from their commencement

I apprehend that the Range Office records are in a very confused state, and any endeavours to search for a particular record will be of no use. In fact I am led to believe from the tenor of your letter under reply that the arrears of accounts are considerable in that office, and that as yet several periodical Statements and Returns, &c, are over due

leave

To,

The Officer in charge of
No 1 or Cuddalore Range,
South Arcot.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No 123 of the 7th instant, also Nos $\frac{A}{100}$ and $\frac{A}{102}$ of the 31st May, and 1st June respectively from Taluk Overseer A. Chappusawmy Mudali. I quite agree with you that an Overseer at Villupuram to replace Mr. Hennessy is much wanted, and A. Chappusawmy Mudali is perfectly well aware of this.

On being transferred to Villupuram Chappusawmy threatened to resign, as he supposed he was to work under the orders of Chanchum Mudali, in this supposition he was wrong, and, as an exceptional case he was permitted to reconsider whether he will join at once or not, and when I was last at Tiruchellur he informed me on the 30th ultimo, that he intended to proceed to Villupuram as soon as he had seen you. The next day 31st he applies through you for one month's leave to fetch his family from Coimbatore, and on the same date he writes another letter to say he was indisposed with dysentery. On the following day he writes for two months leave

* after seeing
you

9

Taluk Overseer A. Chappusawmy Mudali knows all about these works. He is in fact the projector of them. I would therefore earnestly beg to solicit that you will be good enough to retain his services in the 4th Range so that I may, with ease, dispose of all the references in connection with these works.

Having to work my way with great obstacles in my new charge I fear I will be quite unable to make any decided improvements and in the end adopt a systematic method to ensure a speedy progress of works as well as to render punctual submission of accounts, &c., without the aid and assistance of intelligent, willing and honest subordinates.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

(Signed) J M BELL

Assistant Engineer in charge
of No 3 Range, S. Arcot

Taluk Overseer A. Chappusawmy Mudali has been employed in the Salem Range from May to November 1872 in superintending the closing of breaches in various tanks, and has executed his work satisfactorily.

(Signed) A C LAWFORD

Executive Engineer

SALEM,
Dec 2nd 1872

This is to certify that Overseer A. Chappusawmy Mudali has given me every satisfaction while in charge of Polindurai Annicut Project. I can confidently recommend to any officer he will have to serve under as an intelligent, painstaking and trustworthy subordinate well worthy of a sub-divisional charge. I may here add that he has investigated several large irrigation projects, several of which he has successfully superintended and has effected a saving in the estimate.

I shall be glad to see him promoted.

(Signed) J M BELL

Assistant Engineer

TIRUCHELLUR,
No 3 Range Office
31st May 1873

N.B.

There are several letters from Colonel E. A. Ford R.E. and Messrs E. C. Storer & Howard, & C. Lawford & J. Storer opposing my conduct & services, which are not printed in this.

leave because he has reasons to believe that his agents & partners at Arcot & Madras are attempting to deceive him, in this letter he also gives you to understand that he had intended to get himself transferred to another District, but goes on to say he has since decided on joining Villupuram as I had promised to do him good" (which is not true) but wants the leave before he joins.

I have to request you will inform A. Cuppusawmy Mudali that I should not have given him a chance of reconsidering the question as to whether he would join the Villupuram taluk or not except that I thought he had in him the making of a good Overseer. But since it is clear he is under the impression he will be doing me a favor by remaining in the Department, and as I consider both his letters and his conduct altogether insubordinate he is dismissed the Department, from the date on which this order is communicated to him, which you will be good enough to intimate to this office.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
(Signed) R. E. Norfor
District Engineer - Arcot.

District Engineer's Office
Camp Porto Novo
9th June 1873

Forwarded to A. Cuppusawmy Mudali
who is directed to return this letter after perusal.
duly

duly endorsing the date of receipt.

13-6-73.

(Signed) G. E. Wiffen
Range Officer.

/ True Copy /

A. Cuppusawmy Mudali
Late Taluk Overseer,
South Arcot Dist.

Ans. 30. 08/1/73

TO

THE RIGHT HONORABLE

THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,

Fort St. George.

MY LORD,

Adverting to the Order of Government, P W D, dated 26th September 1873, No 180, Memorialist begs to point out that he has not been put in possession of the Orders of Government, Nos 1,762 and 1,763 of the 8th of July 1873, said to have been passed against him

Had Memorialist received these orders and been furnished with the statements made against him by Mr R E Norfor, the Officiating District Engineer, South Arcot District, he would have been in a position to rebut any charges that may have been brought against him

Memorialist humbly begs to state that although in his 3 letters to Government, dated 2nd and 22nd August, and 11th September 1873, respectively, he repeatedly solicited the Government to furnish him with copies of any reports that may have been made against him by the Officiating District Engineer of South Arcot, his applications have been entirely ignored Your Memorialist would therefore, burning under a sense of injustice done to him, humbly venture to bring his unfortunate case again under the consideration of your Lordship's Government

Your Memorialist respectfully appeals against the orders of Mr R E Norfor, dismissing him from the public service, in which service he had earned the good opinion of his immediate superiors, and had gained the position which he had last attained, when he was summarily deprived of his office

The grounds of his dismissal, as intimated to him, through Mr Wiffin, by Mr Norfor, in his letter to Mr Wiffin, (the officer in charge of No 1, or Cuddalore Range, South Arcot), No 331, dated 9th June 1873, are that "he considers both his (Memorialist's) letters and his conduct altogether insubordinate" Your Memorialist respectfully begs to forward a printed copy of his services, together with the copies of testimonials given him by the several officers under whom he had the honor of serving, and in doing so, he humbly begs to draw particular attention to the six certificates given him by Mr Norfor, the gentleman who now summarily ejected him from office In these six testimonials Mr Norfor has only done the Memorialist that justice which is due to him, and in G O, P W D, dated 20th April 1870, No 1,037, it is distinctly stated that "under the very favorable testimony borne by Colonel E A Foord, R E, to the qualifications of the Memorialist, His Excellency the Governor in Council is pleased to exempt him from the prescribed examination for the grade of Taluq Overseer" Moreover, it was only a short time before his dismissal that Mr Norfor wrote to Government in the following terms regarding Memorialist, with reference to the Pelandurai Project, that as "he (your Memorialist), is working most satisfactorily, he should be retained at the Project until the last Rupee is worked out" Taking into consideration that the Memorialist discharged his duties in such a satisfactorily manner for the last 8 years, as to elicit from Mr Norfor those high eulogiums passed on him, as conveyed in his testimonials, and his report to Government, there must have been some potent reason for his, all on a sudden, turning against the Memorialist, and summarily dismissing him from the post of Taluq Overseer

Memorialist will now state the reasons of Mr Norfor's animosity towards him It arose from the following causes

ist begs here to point out that although Mr. Norfor promised not to place the Villapuram Taluq under Manickum's charge, he did so soon after, so that Memorialist would have been placed under this very man's order.

The same day Memorialist was ordered to see Mr. Wiffin at Pelandurai to give him certain information, as he was taking over charge of the Virdachellum Range from Mr. Bell. Memorialist asked Mr. Wiffin, if he could have one month's leave to bring his family from Coimbatore before joining Villapuram, he said Memorialist's services could be spared, and an application was accordingly given for the leave. The same day the leave was applied for, Memorialist received intelligence* that his presence was necessarily required at Madras and Arcot to settle pecuniary matters; thereupon Memorialist asked Mr.

* Letters on the subject already Wiffin's advice in the matter. He recommended Memorialist's taking 2 months' leave at once, so that Memorialist would before Government.

not require any further leave after joining the Villapuram Taluq. Mr. Bell was present when this advice was tendered. Hereupon an application was put in for two months' leave, Mr. Wiffin promising, in the presence of Mr. Bell, to destroy the 1st application. Memorialist was satisfied and awaited the result. Prior to the application for two months' leave, while your Memorialist was giving over charge, he was taken ill, and on the certificate granted by a Governmental officer, 15 days' sick leave was granted him by Mr. Norfor, and published in the Fort St. George Gazette. While thus sick Mr. Wiffin appears to have forwarded the two applications for leave to the Officiating District Engineer, although he gave him (Memorialist) distinctly to understand, in the presence of Mr. Bell that the first application for one month's leave would be destroyed.

During this time of sickness, he received, to his great surprise, the dismissal order, in which among other things, Mr. Norfor states that since it is clear that the Memorialist "is under the impression that he will be doing Mr. Norfor a favor by remaining in the Department he dismissed him." Your Memorialist here would respectfully draw your Lordship's attention to Mr. Norfor's assumption of your Memorialist's impression that he would be doing him a favor by remaining in the Department; perhaps his conscience told him that he did ask a favor of Memorialist when, he did not request; but literally begged of him to falsify the public accounts; for there was no indication whatever on Memorialist's part of the impression falsely imputed to him. These are the facts of the case.

It is not for your Memorialist to state, for your Lordship yourself can plainly see whether or no, on the face of the evidence, as adduced above, your Memorialist has not been cruelly and unjustly dealt with. The charges of insubordination are perfectly groundless; because your Memorialist could not conscientiously falsify the public accounts and could not make good the 123 Rupees of Government money which Mr. Norfor appropriated to himself, he was against him.

Your Memorialist would prominently bring to notice that although he urgently required leave, he would not, if public interests had required it, have quitted his charge, had not Mr. Wiffin told him he could be conveniently spared. Acting on this gentleman's advice, your Memorialist humbly begs to state that he has committed an error of judgment in applying for the leave which he is very sorry for. Even if the District Engineer thought that the leave could not be granted, your Memorialist would, setting all private considerations aside, have proceeded at once to Villapuram to do his duty there. He received no intimation to the effect that the leave could not be granted him, being only put in possession of the order of dismissal in reply to his application for leave.

Your Memorialist humbly begs to state that a public servant of 13 years standing, against whom no complaint was ever made, should have been treated with some consideration. The result of his labors during this period is such as to bring in to Government an increase of Revenue to the extent of 100,000 Rupees. It is merely on the misrepresentation and on the ex-parte statement of Mr. Norfor that an honest public servant of 13 years standing has been

1st.—When Mr. Norfor came on circuit to Virdachellum in February 1873, he sent Memorialist and the Head Accountant of the Range, and read to them a letter from the Engineer for Irrigation, in which this officer called upon Mr. Norfor to make good the sum of Rupees about 4,500, spent by him without proper authority in the construction of a Pandalur and a Road from the allotment of Rs. 1,98,235, sanctioned by Government for the Pandalur Project. Mr. Norfor requested Memorialist and the Head Accountant to distribute a portion of the amount irregularly spent, over the charges of "Brick work" connected with the Project. This request Memorialist was diffident to comply with, as he would thereby be compromising himself, in that he would be falsifying the public accounts. Mr. Norfor therefore went away in high dudgeon. The matter in question, Memorialist believes, is still pending. Memorialist's conduct in this matter is one of the acts of insubordination imputed to him.

2d. The next was regarding the sale of 2 pairs of bullocks and a cart belonging to the Mamathur Project. Mr. Norfor bought them in his father's name for Rupees 123, never paying Government for them. Memorialist reminded him that the amount was not paid, with a view to its being carried to the credit of Government. This transaction occurred in 1869. Memorialist had nothing further to do with the matter, having already done his duty by reporting the non-payment to Mr. Norfor; but in May 1873, to his great surprise, Assistant Engineer Mr. Bell, under whom Memorialist was serving, as Taluq Over-seer, sent him an order from Mr. Norfor, Officiating District Engineer, South Arcot, directing Mr. Bell to retrench from Memorialist's salary the sale proceeds of the Bullocks and cart, Memorialist objected to the retrenchment on the ground that Mr. Norfor himself had used them for about 2 years, and had again re-sold them to the Pelandurai Project, and taken the money himself. Memorialist's letter in this transaction is that of insubordination imputed to him by Mr. Norfor, in his dismissal letter to Mr. Wiffin.

From the foregoing, Memorialist humbly ventures to consider it will be apparent to your Excellency that Mr. Norfor had reason to be not well disposed towards him, in that he would not comply with his most unreasonable requests, whereby he would be compromising himself as a public servant, doing himself and the state an injury.

While matters thus stood, Memorialist, whom Mr. Norfor reported to Government would be kept at the Pelandurai Project "till the last Rupee was worked out," was suddenly, without any cause, transferred to the Villapuram Taluq, in the Cuddalore Range, where supervisor M. Manickum Mudaliar, was Sub-divisional Officer. This Officer, Mr. Norfor had sometime before told Memorialist "was deadly set against him (Memorialist);" because he (Memorialist), when relieving him from the charge of the Project, had brought to notice that Manickum Mudaliar had, during the time the Project was in his charge, expended about Rupees 6,000, in excess of the estimated rates. Being placed under this man, in these circumstances, confirmed the Memorialist in his belief that Mr. Norfor had determined upon ruining him. Memorialist therefore, while, according to the orders he received, was giving over charge, solicited Mr. Norfor to grant him three months' leave without pay, with a view to looking out for employment in some other District; or in case leave could not be granted, to permit him to resign his post, as resignation was preferable to dismissal. Memorialist was neither granted the leave, nor was he permitted to resign.

Mr. Norfor came to Virdachellum and ordered Memorialist to call on him,* and then remonstrated with him regarding his conduct in the matter of the Bullocks and Cart case. Memorialist said that he was a poor man with a large family, and that he could not afford to pay the Rs. 123, out of a limited income of Rs. 80 per mensem. Mr. Norfor then told Memorialist that his letter informing Mr. Bell that Mr. Norfor had used the articles referred to and had never paid their value to Government, was written as an "insinuation." Memorialist was then asked whether he had any objection to proceed to Villapuram. He promised to go accordingly, as Mr. Norfor said that he was not to be placed under the orders of Supervisor Manickum Mudali, your Memorial-

4
cruelly dealt with. Had your Memorialist been put in possession of Mr Norfor's misrepresentations to Government, he would have been able to rebut every charge that may have been brought against him, and if your Lordship could kindly order a public investigation to be held, your Memorialist challenges Mr Norfor to prove what he alleges against Memorialist.

Your Memorialist further begs to state that he has a large family, and is a poor man, and discharged his duties zealously and conscientiously in the hope of bettering his Prospects in the Public Service, and was not, therefore, likely to commit any offence calculated to deprive him absolutely of his livelihood, entail forfeiture of pension, to which he would be entitled in a few years hence, and attach a lasting stigma on his name both in his public and private capacity as a Servant of the state.

Public Servants can only be dismissed for fraud and dishonesty, continued and wilful negligence, Offences involving moral disgrace, and proved incompetency. Your Memorialist was not dismissed for any of these Offences. If Mr Norfor in his representations to the Government did allege any of these causes for having dismissed the Memorialist he has not been put in possession of the allegations to rebut them. It may be called what is popularly known "Stabbing in the dark."

It is well known that your Lordship is the poor man's friend, and that no tyranny or injustice can be perpetrated with impunity during your Lordship's administration of this Presidency.

Your Memorialist will, therefore, leave his case in your Lordship's hands, knowing full well that justice will be accorded to him.

For this act of kindness from your Lordship's hands your Memorialist will ever pray.

Madras.
19th December
1873.

A. Cuppusawmy
late Taluk Overseer,
Celandurai Project, South Arcot District.

Address—

A. Cuppusawmy Muddu
No. 56, Tycondavathiar Street,
Black Town.

PN 9037/175
2/1/309

Cotacaimund, 9th April 1874.

N^o D

From

Lieut. Colonel John Mullins R.E.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

To,

Colonel G. W. Walker R.E.
Secretary to Government
Public Works Department

Sir,

I have the honour with reference to your Memorandum No. 1149 of the 27th February last, directing me to investigate certain charges brought by A. Cuppusawmy Moodelcar, late Overseer in the South Arcot District, against Mr. R. E. Norfor, to report that I have made as complete an enquiry as the circumstances would admit, and the following papers connected therewith are enclosed—

1. The letter from A. Cuppusawmy Moodelcar asked for in para 2 of your Memorandum. It is dated 22nd May 1873.

- 1873 and bears Mr. Norfor's endorsement -
- 2 The evidence and Notes taken at the enquiry, in original
- 3 A letter from Mr. Norfor. 3rd ¹⁰⁰³ dated 14th March, 1873
- 4 - do - from - do - do - dated 30th do
- 5 A Memorandum on the evidence, parts of which has been read by Mr. Norfor
- 6 A letter dated 18th March, 1874, from A. Cuppusawmy, Moodeluy
- 7 A Cuppusawmy's petition dated 19th December 1873 containing the charges against Mr. Norfor, and a packet of papers received from your office
- 2 The Memorandum on the evidence contains the opinions which I have formed on the subject of the 2 charges. With regard to the first, in which it is implied that Mr. Norfor wished the accounts of the Pelandoran Ancient project ~~to be falsified~~, in order to reduce the amount of the unauthorized outlay on the Bungalow belonging to the work, there is apparently no foundation -

whatever -

3 The other charge, relating to Government bullocks is certainly incorrect in some particulars. The Government bullocks purchased by Mr. Norfor's Father at the sale of the Melumatooor Ancient stock were paid for in 1873, and I see no reason for supposing that Mr. Norfor was aware that payment had not been previously made. A. Cuppusawmy, Moodeluy did not remind Mr. Norfor that the bullocks had not been paid for, neither did he report the non-payment, except by forwarding the account of the sale in the first instance to Mr. Norfor, who was then Range Officer. For the reasons given in the Memorandum on the evidence it is not clear exactly what were the details of the purchases of bullocks in June 1870 for the Pelandoran Ancient, except that Mr. Norfor bought for that work for Rupees 100 a pair of bullocks which had before belonged

4. It is unfortunately abundantly evident that Mr. R. B. Norfor, whether in his capacity as a Range Officer, or subsequently as District Engineer, did not perform his duties in a manner proper to his position, or recognize the responsibilities which that

Voluntarily
Lieut Col R. S.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

P. W. 1875 Sept
No: 2112A.

From

The Chief Insp.
for Investigation

Dated 9 April
Reel 10 - - - 1874.

S. G. No: 305A 3-2-75.
No: D.

Reporting the re-
sult of the investigation
of certain charges brought
by A Cupposawung
Moodellair, Cate Oversee
in the South Aceh D.
against Mr. R. E.
Norfor, Executive Dir.

No 94A

612-7-75

No 149

Memorandum

ind. - - - - -

The undersigned is directed
to request the Chief Engineer (for
Investigation to be good enough, during
his present tour in the South Aceh
District to take the opportunity of
investigating the charges which have
been brought by A Cupposawung
Moodellair late ~~Head Accountant~~
in the Undachellum Range
against Mr. Norfor, referred to in
the Petition recorded with G. O
No. 181 dated 24th February 1874.

It is requested that in re-
porting the result of the investigation
the letter written by Cupposawung
to Mr. Norfor and noticed by the
members of Government in their
remarks on the draft G. O may
be

be submitted

A Coopersawmy Aludaiar
has been directed to meet the
Chief Engineer for irrigation, and
apudachellam, and he leaves
Madras for the purpose this
Evening.

W. M. L. D. D. S.

27 July 1874
J. M. L. D. S.

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation with papers

Memorandum

The evidence on the first charge made
by the late Taluk Overseer A. Coopersawmy
against Mr. R. C. Norfor viz. that the
latter wished the accounts of the Palandurai
Anicut to be falsified, in order to reduce
the cost of the Anicut. Bungalow, will be
found at pp. 1 to 12, 19, 20 to 23, 45 to 52 of
my notes.

Evidence was given by

Late Overseer A. Coopersawmy 2^d 1 to 60, pp. 1 to 12, 22 and 23.
— Head Accountant Ponarungum — 61 to 80 — 45 to 52.

Particulars of certain correspondence on the
subject are given at pp. 19 to 21 of the notes.

The facts of the case are that no proper
record of the cost of the Bungalow was kept,
that expenditure on it and on several other
accounts was charged to sundries without
any thing to show to what particular
work the entries referred, that in June
1871, the Bungalow was measured and
an estimate of its cost at current District
rates was prepared by A. Coopersawmy,
and this cost was then put down at
Rupees 2440, that Mr. Bell considered

this

this amount to be less than its real cost, owing principally to machine made bricks, which were very expensive, having been made use of in its construction, and that he raised the charges on this account to Rupees 3292-2-0; that there was no account of the number of machine made bricks actually used on the Bungalow construction; that Mr. Norfor on the other hand considered both A. Cuppusawmy's and Mr. Bell's estimates too high, and that part of these amounts were properly chargeable to the Ancient brick work.

Such evidence as there is is against the presumption that Mr. R. B. Norfor wished the accounts to be falsified. He and Mr. Bell entertained different opinions as to the manner or proportion in which certain expenditure, which appertained to several works, should be distributed, and as the former was believed to be personally interested in the matter, he has been charged with a desire to falsify

the accounts -

The questions connected with responsibility for unauthorized outlay will have to be disposed of when the information long since called for has been submitted.

The second charge made by A. Cuppusawmy Moot against Mr. R. B. Norfor is -

that Mr. Norfor bought 2 pairs of bullocks and a cart belonging to the Mainathoor project for 123 Rupees never paying Government for them;

that, after using these bullocks for about 2 years, he resold them to the Belandore project. In support of this charge evidence was given by -

A. Cuppusawmy Moot 2nd - 1 to 27 p/p 13 to 18.

do 28 to 31 - 24 to 25

do 32 to 35 - 33 to 35

late overseer's writer Shunmooga Moot " 32 to 35 - 25 to 33.

late head Cooly Moottoosamy Pillay " 163 to 183 - 53 to 58

late Maistry Pungasawmy " 184 to 194 - 58 to 61

late Bandy Maistry Vydehigum Moot " 195 to 238 - 62 to 76

Mr. R. E. Norfor also called 2 witnesses.

Overseer D. Coopussawmy Mood: 28. 96 to 141 pp. 36 to 42
late Mr. B. T. Norfor's Buttes }
Cortham Mood: } — 142 to 162 — 42 to 44.

Mr. Norfor's account of the transactions is given in para. 7 of his letter A-1003 of the 4th March 1874, and may be summarized thus.

1st that his Father purchased 2 pairs of bullocks and a cart at the sale of the Mehmatoor live stock for the use of his sugar factory.

2nd that Mr. R. E. Norfor was not until 1873 aware that the bullocks and cart had not been paid for by his Father, and that on hearing such was the case, he first of all called upon the Overseer to pay, but subsequently, as a result of certain correspondence with the Controller he paid for them himself.

3rd that on his Father's sugar factory being closed he took off his Father's hands one pair of bullocks and a cart.

* as the person responsible for the collection of the sale proceeds

cart, and sometime afterwards bullocks being required to work the brick-mill at the Pelandorai Anicut, the other pair was sold to that work.

In support of this statement there is a copy of the Bill of sale of the Mehmatoor live stock showing Mr. B. T. Norfor to have been the purchaser of 2 pairs of bullocks and a cart, there is the endorsement on this bill or statement ordering the Overseer (A. Cuppusawmy) to be retrenched for not having recovered at the proper time the amount due by Mr. B. T. Norfor and there are the letters in which the Rupees 123 due were ultimately paid in two instalments.

* W. 364-17 June 1873
— 482-16 July —

A. Cuppusawmy Mood: on being called upon in May 1873 to pay by retrenchment from his salary the amount

The voucher No. 57 is in the form
ON and it runs thus.

	Quantity	Price			On what account purchased	Payments	
		Rate	Amount	Total from this Debit		Amount	When paid
Palmiraks-	40	1.00	40		Consisting an amount due to the Sollarsy people near Mankharan, purchased		
Pair of strong Bullock for Buck machine	1		150				
Pair of Bullock with New Cart	1		150				
				340		340	

Total of the Month. 340

Total - 340

Deduct payments -

Amount remain-
ing unpaid -

This voucher is unsigned: it is
said that it is not usual to submit
this form to the Controller: there
were, at least at the moment, no
receipts taken from those who
actually received the money which
could be produced, and so far
as could be ascertained there
was nothing on record to show
the details of the transac-

transactions.

It must however be noticed that it
was not easy under the circumstances
to look up the records, for the enquiry
had to be held at different places
and the Range Office at Verdachellum
where most of the records are, is not the
head quarters of the Supervisor now in
charge of the Range, who lives at the
head quarters of his own sub-division,
Chidimbaram.

The cash book entries are not a
record of facts, but apparently a techni-
cal way of recording transactions, and
in a manner far from convenient
apart from the impropriety of accounts
being so kept as to make it difficult
to obtain information from them.

There is nothing however exceptional
about the entries connected with this
particular transaction; it appears to
have been recorded in precisely the
same way as many others.

Receipts given by Mr. Noifore on account
of his Father, and from the person
from whom the other pair was
purchased

purchased, or the counterfoil of the cheque book, might have rendered the particulars of the transaction clear. as it is all that is evident is that a number of cheques, on the date of this transaction, are entered as having been cashed, and then that the cash was paid to certain parties, whereas such was not the fact as the treasury, or one treasury at least, was at a great distance, and moreover 6 or 8 cheques for different sums would not have been drawn but for the purpose of being the means of payment.

The last entry in the form O. II above given is stated to refer to the bullocks purchased from Mr. B. J. Norfor for the Ament, the cart being one purchased at Pondicherry, and Mr. Norfor has explained that the

Bullocks were sold to the	
Ament for Rupees	100
Cart	50

It must be noticed here that it is clear from the evidence that this pair of bullocks was a colored pair, and that

that the price at which it was purchased at the sale of the ^{Mehmat} bullocks in November 1869, was Rupees 38. With regard to the other pair of bullocks Mr. Norfor was not apparently at first quite clear as to whence they had been obtained, but afterwards D. Coopposawmy Moodi, an Overseer now in the Department, and who was in attendance during the inspection of the Pelandora works, informed him that he had bought this pair for the Pelandora Ament when Mr. Norfor, in 1870, had told him that he wanted bullocks for that work, and although he had not at the time said so, they were really his own bullocks. There is a considerable difference in the history of this pair of bullocks as given by A. Cupposawmy and his witnesses on the one hand, and by D. Coopposawmy on the other hand.

According

According to the account of Mr. R. E. Norfor's accuser, this white pair of bullocks, with others, was purchased by D. Coopposawmy Mood at the Trinomaly festival, which appears to be also a cattle fair, in November 1868 for the Peenapore or Mehinatoot Ament works, that though charged thereto it was used by Mr. Norfor himself in his cart up to November 1869, when it was purchased in Mr. B. J. Norfor's name, not however like the rest of the live stock at public auction but at the highest price realized by the other cattle, that then Mr. Norfor continued to use these bullocks until they were sold to the Pelandorai Ament in 1870 where they remained until 1871, when, with the rest of the cattle obtained for that work, they were sold by auction at Virdachellum. D. Coopposawmy Mood on the other hand states that these bullocks were purchased for him by a friend

Id's credit from
indian gov't

Wm. Wm. sub. 11/15

at Trinomalay some few days before he was sent there to make purchase of cattle for Government, that he retained them from that time - November 1868 - until the beginning of 1870, when before going on leave to Madras he sold them to Mr. Norfor for the Pelandorai Ament. Also that he was paid in cash for them at Virdachellam before he went on leave in January or February 1870.

That part of D. Coopposawmy's statement which is verifiable by the records is not so supported, for the bullocks which he is supposed to have sold to the Pelandorai Ament were purchased for that work and paid for in June 1870, or 4 or 5 months after the time he states that he was paid for them, and the date of his leave, i.e. whether it was taken in the cold or hot weather could not readily be mistaken, neither would it seem probable that he had forgotten when he was paid.

Bad

Had the transactions been fully and properly recorded and receipts taken, it might have been practicable to exhibit them in their true light. As it is Mr. Norfor, the Range Officer at the time, appears in the Form O.II Voucher as virtually the one dealer from whom palmyras, bullocks and cart were obtained.

It may here be noticed that the bullocks purchased for the Pelandorai Amint were -

In June 1870 - 1 pair - - 150

do - - 1 do - - 100

In Decr - do - 3 pairs - 186

Total Rupees 436.

bullocks and
Cart - 150

* Cart is said
to have been 50

and on the sale of these bullocks in May 1871 the amount realized for the 5 pairs was Rupees 295-2-

The preceding part of this Memorandum on the evidence was sent to Mr. R.E. Norfor, together with the evidence of Tydelingum Moodely, which was taken when Mr. Norfor was not present, for any observations or explanations

explanations he might wish to offer, and his reply is contained in the accompanying letter dated 30th March.

In the absence of documentary evidence and especially of the receipts for the payments made in June 1870 for the bullocks and cart charged to the Pelandorai Amint, it is not practicable to corroborate Mr. Norfor's account of the transaction. As the matter at present stands, the evidence adduced by the late Overseer A. Cuppusawmy Moodeliar is opposed to that account, and what little documentary evidence is available in the Cash book and Form O.II account is rather against than in favour of Mr. Norfor's narrative. I am nevertheless by no means convinced of the truthfulness of the evidence given by A. Cuppusawmy's witnesses. It appeared to me that their memories were too good regarding incidents of a kind not likely to be very clearly remembered, which occurred several years ago, and which related to the sale of the Mehmatoor bullocks, while other matters concerning themselves more immediately and therefore more likely to fix themselves in the memory had been forgotten, and this appeared to indicate that the account

Entered in
Norfor's Statement
Interview

to be given at the engine had been carefully gone over before-hand. Vydelingen Moodely's narrative in answer to Q 205 is, to say the least, singularly circumstantial, and his memory for the minute particulars of transactions which took place, more than 14 years before is certainly surprising.

With regard to that part of the charge which makes Mr. R. E. Norfor to have been the purchaser of Bullocks in November 1869, which were entered in the sale account as sold to his Father, it may be remarked that Mr. R. E. Norfor would hardly have called upon the late Overseer to pay for them had he himself been the purchaser, and it is quite possible that A. Cuppa - Sawmy Moodely may have concluded that the bullocks belonged to Mr. R. E. Norfor only because he had noticed that they were being used by him.

Supposing Mr. Norfor's account of the transactions to be virtually correct, it is evident that his purchase of a pair of bullocks from his Father for the Pelandorai Anient at a price far exceeding that which had been given some 7 months before for the same bullocks was highly objectionable. It was wrong to buy his Father's bullocks at all.

on account of Government, and it was at least clearly Mr. Norfor's duty to take care that the price paid was not greater than that which had been paid at the sale of the Mehmatoor Stock. It is really but little to the point to say that the bullocks had improved, and were worth more in June 1870 than in November 1869. Mr. Norfor thought proper to enter into a transaction which was easily capable of misconstruction, and his want of proper appreciation of his duty in the matter has involved him in difficulties.

Wendellin Wolke,
Chief Inspector of Migration

8 April 1874

N^o A District Engineer's Office
1003 South West
Camp Plancher by March
from 1874

The District Engineer
South West

To The Chief Engineer for Irrigation and Joint Secretary to Government D.D.W.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your memorandum No. 1 dated 2nd instant together with its enclosures; an appeal petition from A. Co. pressing. Most of the latter, in this District being one of the latter, in which certain charges are preferred against me, and which you have been requested by Government to enquire into.

2 While fully concurring the fullest enquiry into my official conduct I cannot but express my regret that after so long a service in the Department the good name I have always borne in it should have been so slandered and my actions so misrepresented.

"literally begged of A Cooper sawney to
falsify the accounts in connection with the
Volunteer account" it is stated that I
sent for A Cooper sawney (the petitioner)
and saw him the first account book
in the Range his book and directed
certain alterations to be made in a com-
parative statement submitted to the Chief
Engineer for Irrigation by Lieut. Ford
before his departure from the District
and that because he refused to comply with
my request I went away from Vinda-
chellum in high disgust and considered
as this an act of insult and indignity on his part
he I am sorry to be obliged to say so, but
this is a very highly colored picture, ^{and I am} ~~very~~ ^{gladly}
so highly colored that there is none of the
true truth left in it.

7 When I took charge of the District
from Colonel Ford his District
dated had just been despatched
to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation and
shortly afterwards I received that officer's
reply No. of calling for in-
formation regarding excesses in certain items

Of Estimate. Mr. Bell the Range Officer
was called upon to give any explanation
he had to offer in connection with these excesses,
and Mr. Hawksworth was in like manner
asked to furnish his explanation through his
District Engineer. Mr. Hawksworth's re-
ply was not submitted through me and I
therefore know nothing in reference to this item
(gabonized iron roofing) till I heard you
mention the explanation a few mornings ago.
As regards Mr. Bell's explanation however
I simply could get nothing out of him in
all I came to Vindachellum myself and
insisted upon an explanation. I walked
over to Mr. Bell at the Range Office
where he was lodging produced the com-
parative statement he had submitted
(a copy of which is what Colonel Ford
sent to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation
and expressed to him my desire to furnish
the explanations called for by the Chief Eng-
for Irrigation with as little delay as pos-
sible he thereon called A Cooper sawney
and his Head Accountant. I did
not send for them as stated by A Cooper
sawney the whole thing took place
in the Range Office Vindachellum and
Mr. Bell was the party I looked to for
the necessary explanations and he called on
those two who brought forward the records
in

in connection with the work
To ascertain the correctness of the
Comparative statement above alluded to
I asked to see the Register of work station
Books and other documents which would
explain matters and I also had with me the
Palandorac file belonging to my office.
On looking over the papers that were shown
me I found that the Register, the station
Books and the Comparative statement
(alluded to before) were to all appearances
cooked up. The station Books I was told were
not kept in as complete a manner as
they should be and then the actual ex-
penditure under various heads were ac-
knowledged to be guesswork. A great many
station Books were even not forthcoming &
not found to this day. The item representing
the cost of the Bangalore, and which was
that is made much of as it is generally believed
I shall have to pay for it, is only one out of
many I could not get a satisfactory expla-
nation for. A. Cooper himself
estimates the cost of the Bangalore at Rs 2640
in the statement sent to Colonel Boscawen
but he puts the cost of the work in the
Comparative statement down as Rs 3292-2-0

this

this was certainly one of the several items
I asked for explanations for but could get
nothing satisfactory. Not one of them could
explain satisfactorily to me how the Com-
parative statement was drawn up from
the Register which was shown me and
which does not correspond in any way
with the sub-accounts in the Comparative
statement and as far as I could under-
stand as I have already said there
was a great deal of guesswork in the
matter. I am said to have gone away
in "high dudgeon"; I certainly went
away very much disgusted with the whole
state of things and asked Mr. Bell to
prepare a revised statement of work
performed showing each head of expendi-
ture fully supported by detailed accounts
as he is required to maintain by the
rules of the Department, and absolutely
necessary in an important work of this
kind. I was moreover distinctly told
that the Buckwork was not done at
the rate shown in the Comparative state-
ment and I desired that this should
be rectified and expressed my belief that
charges properly appertaining to Buckwork
Chunaw

Chunam had been wrongly entered under
excavation of foundations and Backing water
which is generally looked upon I found as
very elastic items; but I fancy because I
wished to remove his H. & Accountant Pann
-rangam from his Range I received
from Mr Bell a dense official misdirection
-ing my instructions into a desire on my part
to falsify the accounts exactly corresponding
with the view held by A. Cooprosammy in
his petition to Government all of them -
Mr Bell A. Cooprosammy and Pannrangam
it is evident did all they could to mystify
the matters and so get the best of me by
endeavouring to confuse me as much as
possible. in fact the accounts to this day
up to the time these men left the District
are in such a state of confusion that I
confess it is beyond me to set them straight.
the records kept are as I shall show you ut-
terly unreliable. at the best I can only
strike a sort of average rate at which
the various items of estimate have been
worked judging from the present working.
it is only since Mr Hecken took charge
of the work that there has been any thing
in the shape of accounts systematically
and properly kept. I am prepared to
prove that work supposed to have been
done & charged for in the accounts for March 1872

were

were not completed till May following.
this was done under A. Cooprosammy's very
nose and if the Range Officer was not
aware of this, all I can say is he ought
to have been, and that this would not
have occurred if large sums of money had
not been thrust upon the Overseers who were
told that they must spend it all, it is be-
-cause I made a stir in the matter and tried
to get to the bottom of it that I became so
much disliked; but I was determined
they should not have a chance of continuing
their little game, and so transferred
A. Cooprosammy to Villapuram, and his
brother-in-law Pannrangam to my Office.
this I considered advisable on public
grounds and you doubtless know how
obstinately my orders were set at defiance
by one and all of them i.e. Mr Bell, Pann-
-rangam and A. Cooprosammy there are
G.O.s on the subject which I can show you
if desired at any rate. I must positively
deny the charge of wishing or rather literally
begging Cooprosammy to falsify the ac-
-counts. I consider I only did my duty
in examining the Registers Station Books
&c. and finding them unreliable to
call upon the Range Officer to give me
something

something I could depend upon supported
by proper vouchers, this is all I wanted

9 I will now go on to the 2nd charge he makes viz that I bought 2 pairs of Bull - locks and a cart in my Father's name and never paid their value to Government viz Rs 123; the facts of the case are as follows - in 1869 when the Mahabatom Amunt works were completed and the live stock and carts no longer required, I directed A. Gopposawmy then in charge there to take them all to Buddalore and sell them by Public Auction and to credit the sale Proceeds in his accounts against the work the cattle were I believe pocketted in my Father's Compound till the day of sale and at the sale he purchased 2 pairs of Bullocks ^{and a cart} for the use of his sugar Factory works A Gopposawmy was distinctly told to collect all the money from the sale, and credit the same in his accounts, and until I was informed by Mr Bell in 1873 I was not aware that this money had not been in the first instance collected. I was then told that A Gopposawmy had informed me of the fact. I was positive he did not and ordered Mr Bell to search his ^{Range} office records and send me the sale statement. Gopposawmy

is said to have submitted to the Range,
none however could be found and I got
instead a copy of a letter and statement
in the records of the Overseer's Office I
certainly never saw the originals of these
and I am by no means inclined to think
they were ever sent. As A Cooper sawing
was distinctly told to collect all monies of
this account I considered him to blame
for not having collected this (that is if he
did not which I am unable to ascertain
my Father having subsequently died) I
ordered him to make this sum good, but on
a reference to the Controller he considered
and I now think properly so, that the
Government would consider the Range
Officer and not the Overseer the responsible
party. Under the circumstances I paid the
money myself and the amount has been credit-
ed in the accounts of the Range - as re-
gards using the cattle and carts I have
to state that after a time the Factory was
closed as it was not possible owing to pecu-
niary embarrassments to work it. I then
took off my Father's hands the cart and
one pair of Bullocks and sometime after-
wards when we wanted a pair of Bullocks
to work the Buck-mill at the Pelandray
amount

Healthy marriage
after

District Comm-
 Washington
 William C. ...

Skipped thru
 how's the
 the machine
 blowing
 to the
 about 100

Amunt the second pair of Bullocks were sold to the work these are the true facts in this matter and A. Coopersawmy I believe to be as perfectly acquainted with them as I am

I see at what
it is of a sort of
dist. of purchase
in order to be
last date -
business in account

10 If there are any other points in the petition worthy of notice I am prepared to answer them as to my having transferred the petitioner to Villapuram suddenly without any cause all I can say is that I had good reasons to consider the change necessary and it was the Overseer's duty to obey orders and not give trouble on the contrary, he was very impertinent and overbearing in his behaviour so much so that I nearly lost my temper the extent of expecting him forcibly out of my tent and when I did order him out I made him distinctly to understand I would assuredly dismiss him if he did not at once proceed to Villapuram, and which he did not do, but wrote for leave instead, after informing ^{me} he would start the following day I of course then adopted extreme measures and dismissed him.

11 I will be glad if you will allow me to show you while at the Amicut the accounts I refer to in this letter and papers

papers bearing on the subject in my office I will put before you at Buddalore.

I have the honor to be
Sir

your most Obedient Servant

A. M. S. S.

District Engineer
South Arcot

1st known as before.
 With reference
 to the changes in
 suit Dr. New.
 for transfer for
 want in this
 Petition (supra)
 summary heard.
 is informed that
 if he is prepared
 to substantiate
 his charges the
 Chief of Police
 who is just now
 engaged in
 looking into
 matters in South
 West, that offi-
 cer will be in-
 structed through
 the investigation
 the matter of
 fraud in the past

J. H. Jones
 J. H. Jones

No. 111
 1003
 From
 The District Engineer
 To
 The Chief Engineer
 for Bridge & Ties
 Dated 4th March 73
 Recd.
 C. H. Jones
 3rd February 1875 No. 309
 Affirming certain
 instructions in
 regard to charges
 against a number
 of men by J. H. Jones
 and J. H. Jones
 as seen.

[Faint, mostly illegible handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.]

P. D.
 Pro. of the Madras Govt.
 Near the following

Petition from A. Coopossawmy Mooré (A. E. dated
 late Culey Overseer, South Arcot Dist. } 19th Decr 73

The Petitioner makes
 two - if not more - distinct
 charges, which have a
 prima facie appearance of
 truth against Mr. Hooper -
 - whom I admit I distrust -
 and they must be inquired into.
 Further it appears that he
 has never seen the charge
 made against him by Mr. Hooper.
 I would give him the 40s of
 Capt. Mooré & of 8th July (two) to
 enable him to defend himself.
 Now as to the inquiry whether
 rules might not be sent to the
 Petitioner to the Collector to see what
 evidence the Petitioner brings
 in support of the two charges. He
 might receive it with the knowledge
 of Hooper and transmit for consideration.
 I think the man has not been
 fairly dealt with and that too much
 reliance has been put on the
 word of a man like Hooper.
 He should be restored of his
 position from time
 to time.

A. Coopossawmy
 Moorélliar is referred
 to the order of Govern-
 ment No. 180 of 26th
 September passed on
 his 3 Petitions of the
 21st June, 22nd August
 and 11th September 1873
 as the final decision
 of Govt. in his case.
 He was never fully
 qualified for the post
 of Salook Overseer. His
 elevation to which ap-
 pears to have led him
 to

He was
 I am
 the writing

of preassume on the value
of his services and to
take liberties and in-
dulge in practices
incompatible with
his further employment
in the Govt. service.

Enclosed in
M.G.O. 37-4-1875 No 309

I enclose letter to
Mr. Norfor &
practically
refusing to join his
new station. The
interest we can do
I think is to take
for the letter - if
it be taken in ex-
istence.

As to his charges
against his works

The Petitioner appears
to have been dismissed on
sufficient ground: and
his dismissal was offered
by the Govt.

He now brings distinct and
very serious charges against
Mr. Norfor, who should be
informed of them, and who
if they are false ought to
prosecute the Petitioner for
defamation.

Perhaps for the present the
course suggested by Mr. Norfor
will be the best.

I think the best course
will be for the Chief Engr
to demand for him (he is in
London) and as it is in
his hands he is in London
to be able to take them
in what manner I think

To
Colonel John Challinor, R.E.
Chief Engineer for Brigadier
and Joint Secretary to Government,
P.W.D.

Most Honored Sir,

I beg leave most respectfully
to state the following, I have to say in
connection with the charges against Mr. Norfor
R.E. Major, Offg. District Engineer, which
your honor has investigated.

Mr. Norfor's request to reduce the cost
of Bangalore from 352 thousand Rs.
and to include the difference to the
last "Bribe in Chandra, with" estimate.

The first charge
your honor is aware
has been proved
both by records and

witnesses. Mr. Ponarungam, Mr. Lake Head's
accountant, Mr. Bell, whom I cited also
as a witness may be called upon, if neces-
sary, to give his evidence.

Mr. R.E. Major, purchasing on Mr. B.T.
Major's name, 2 pairs of Bullocks and
a cart, belonging to Channathur Amma
for Rs. 123, never paying Government their
value and using them himself.

As regards the
second charge, by
the fact of the
Bullocks and cart
having been
purchased on

Mr. B.T. Major's name, never paying Govt.
their value. Rs. 123, requires no proof, since
the accounts do not show any recovery of

of the sale proceeds thereof. Vide Mr. Bell's letter, No 28 dated 1st May 1873, and its Enclosures (my letter No 56, dated 26th December 1869).

The fact of their having been purchased by Mr. R.E. Norfor (on Mr. B.T. Norfor, his father's name), and used by him until their resale to the Pelandurai Project, has been brought to Mr. R.E. Norfor's notice by me so long ago as May 1873 in my letter to the address of Mr. Bell, when ~~my~~ my pay was threatened to be retrenched. Mr. Norfor's silence for the last 11 months is in itself a best evidence of his confession to the facts of the statements made in my letter quoted above.

But now Mr. Norfor tries to prove that he never used the bullocks and Cart himself, and for that purpose he produced 2 witnesses, viz. - Talug Overseer D. Cuppusawmy Mudr. and late Mr. B.T. Norfor's Butler Cartha Mudr.

D. Cuppusawmy Mudr. deposed to the effect that he sold his bullocks to Mr. R.E. Norfor for Pelandurai Annicut, and in about a week afterwards sent them to Pelandurai Annicut for the use of Brick Machine work. On cross examination it was proved that he sold the bullocks a fortnight or a

month before he left Tiruchellum for Madras on 2 months' Privilege leave. Here, your honor will observe that he took leave in January or February 1869; at that time the Pelandurai Project works were not commenced, nor were they sanctioned. From the above it is evident that the Deposition of Overseer D. Cuppusawmy Mudr. is false.

They also to point out that Mr. Norfor, as deposed by Overseer D. Cuppusawmy Mudr. consulted with him (D. Cuppusawmy Mudr.) on the subject prior to, and after the deposition was taken from me.

6th instant.

for Rs. 38.

Mr. Norfor's 2^d witness, Butler Cartha Mudr., deposed that he himself bought in Auction at Chennai a cuppusawmy in 1869, 2 carts and 2 pairs of bullocks. The evidence of this witness will also be found to be false, as only 1 pair of bullocks ~~was~~ (black and red), was bought in Auction, and that too bid and purchased by Head Cooly Chittasawmy Pillay, by order of Mr. R.E. Norfor. The other pair of bullocks and 1 cart, not two as the Butler deposed, were taken by Mr. R.E. Norfor at the highest rates, which other bullocks and carts fetched in Auction. Vide my List and the Moonisiff's Accounts, which accompanied

accompanied it.

From the latter account it will be clearly seen, that the pair of bullocks bought from Overseer D. C. Appaswamy Mudali and a cart, which were taken by Mr. Norfor for the highest prices, were not sold with others in Public Auction.

This fact and the fact that Mr. R. E. Norfor has been himself using the said 2 pairs of bullocks and 1 cart until resale to Belandurai Annamut in 1870, have been corroborated by one and all of my witnesses, though they differed a little about the number of bullocks and carts sold in Auction, which is attributed to the length of time, - about 5 years, since the transaction took place. Information regarding these matters which are not disputed by either party, may be had from the Office Records.

Regarding the Cash Accounts and vouchers in which the entries of the purchase, sale and resale of the bullocks and carts are made, I respectfully beg to state that the correctness or otherwise of the Vouchers Mr. Norfor has been shewing to your honor during the time of investigation, and which I was not then permitted by him to see, will be evinced only after the examination of them by the Assistant

Controller, who has just now commenced investigating them.

Trusting that the above circumstances may be taken into your honor's favorable consideration,

Very &c remain

Yours most obedient & humble servant

A. Appaswamy Mudali

Sub. Secy. to the P. P. M.

Vidachellam
18th March
1874.

an opportunity of defending
myself.

Begging pardon for intruding
on your honor's valuable moments,

I humbly beg remain,
Most Honored Sir,
your most obedient & humble servant,

A. Cuppusawmy
Late Taluk Quarter D.P.W.

Coinabatore.
2^d August 1873.

Please Address,

A. Cuppusawmy Mudda
Late Taluk Quarter D.P.W.
Rajapur Street,
Coinabatore.

MS 263/73.

Enclosure
1. Copy of
Testimonials.

37
To
Colonel G. W. Walker, R.E.
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.
Madras
Most Honored Sir,
I beg leave most respectfully
to be excused for the liberty I have taken
for the third time to solicit the favor
of furnishing me with the copies of
the reports against me of Mr. R. E. C.
for the officiating District Engineer of
South Arcot District and the orders of
Government thereon which have not been
communicated to me up to date.
I beg also to be excused for my having
to acquaint your honor once more in some
clearer a light that of late I had
dismissed me, because I did not sub-
mit to him in compromising certain
matters, which, if done, would involve
me

me seriously into trouble.

When Mr. Norfor visited the Belandur
Anicut on the 22^d of April 1873, he
was very much pleased with my works,
and on the 23^d after inspecting the
channel and other works up to Stree-
mustum, I was told that the works
turned out by me were more than what
he expected & at last he expressed
his entire satisfaction and promised
to recommend me for promotion.

Immediately about a week or so
afterwards, I have received through
the Range Officer (Mr. Bell) orders
intimating that the non-recovery of
^{amount of a cart and 2 pairs}
the sale of bullocks, Rs. 123, taken by
Mr. Norfor on his father's name in 1869
should be retrenched from my pay,
to which I replied that I cannot
find any reason why my pay should
be retrenched, while the cart & bullocks
were taken & used by Mr. R.E. Norfor himself.

order
to pay
disputed

and afterwards told by him to Belandur
Anicut works.
This is, Honored Sir, one of the causes
which, all on a sudden, induced Mr. R.E.
Norfor to withdraw me from the
charge of the Belandur Anicut Project
and afterwards dismiss me, without any
justifiable cause or reason.

I presume Mr. Norfor might have
represented a great deal against me to
the Government, I therefore humbly
pray that on ground of humanity and
equity my request may be granted as
I am well aware that a paternal Govt.
is never inclined to dismiss an old and
faithful servant of theirs of 13 years -
standing without just cause. This principle
however cannot be acted upon without
hearing the story on both sides & therefore
in fairness to themselves & to me as well
the grant of copies of documents now
applied for may be granted and my
right.

right protected.

I beg to remain

Most Honoured Sir,

Your honors most obedient and

humble servant

A. Cappaiaudingia

late Taluk Overseer D.M.

Coimbatore.

11th September
1873

Please address

A. Cappaiaudingia

late Taluk Overseer

Rajapur Street

Coimbatore

Extract from the South Arcot Gazette dated Saturday
October 23rd 1869 page 432.

x x 4P x

Notice

The undersigned will sell by Public a
at Cuddalore opposite the Tahsildar's
on Monday the 1st November next; if
previously disposed of by private sale
two four wheeled platform Trucks,
several pairs of bullocks with carts,
Carts, in separate lots.

The bullocks are young and strong and
the carts in good order.

The above may be seen at Fort St.
David Cuddalore ten days previous to the
sale.

No 4 Range Office
Vudachellum 12th October
1869

/Sd/ P. E. Norfor
Executive Engineer
No 4 Range S. A.

/ True Extract /

P. E. Norfor
District Engineer

P. O. 1870

From No 5264.

St. Augustine's

late Selang Queen

7 20903 24th 1869

Colonel G. W. Walker, R.E.

Secretary & Government

P.W.D.

dated 11th 24th 1869

Received 24th 1869

Enclosure 1. V

Respectfully to the

and with the

of the report of

the R.E. Major, D.C. & Co.

of the report against him

to enable him to see in his

affair.

Extract from the
South Arcot Gazette
dated 23rd October
1869 page 432.
Adverting the sale
of Boddliar & Co
Public Auction

Mr. J. S. S. S. S.
No. 309

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Read the following

Petition from
Coopoo sawmy
No. 181
No. 182
No. 183
No. 184
No. 185
No. 186
No. 187
No. 188
No. 189
No. 190
No. 191
No. 192
No. 193
No. 194
No. 195
No. 196
No. 197
No. 198
No. 199
No. 200

the order of Government
No. 180 of 26th September
passed on his 3 petitions
of the 21st June, 2nd
August, and 11th Sept.
1873 as the final de-
cision of Government
in his case.

With reference to the
2 charges against Mr
Norfor brought forward
in this Petition Coopoo
sawmy Boddliar is

Pass the 2nd Para
20/2 MR

informed that if he
 is prepared to sub-
 stantiate them in
 person before the Chief
 Engineer for Irrigation
 who has just now started
 on a tour in South
 Creek, that Officer

will be instructed
 to investigate the matter
 on the spot

[Faint handwritten notes and signatures]
 e. 16. July 1914

[Handwritten notes and signatures]
 The Chief Eng. for Irrigation
 District Engineer
 Controller P. H. A. S.
 A. S. [unclear] [unclear]
 Staff 22-2-75

[Faint handwritten notes]
 Refers to the Petition 24/2/14

[Faint handwritten notes]
 I am unable
 to agree with Col. Mullins
 finding on the inquiry
 so far as it goes.

Mr. [unclear] does not
 come into Court
 with clean hands and
 the prima facie assumption
 in this case is against
 him.
 In the first case - He
 took the Benjals without
 authority and has made
 responsible. He then
 placed himself in the
 hands of his subordinates
 and [unclear] was not
 the one who considered
 that

in fact that the valuation which
is given by Mr. Norfords
was unduly low. I think
his conduct throughout
was shuffling. I believe
the evidence and think
that Cippsamy has
fully justified his position
as far as it was possible.
The state of Mr. Norfords
account preclude what
I believe would be
more condemnatory proof
but he must not be
allowed to plead that
fact as whitewashing
himself. Its effect is really
the opposite.

In the other the Bullocky
Case:- The facts show
that Mr. Norfords conduct
was shuffling and
improper in the extreme.
e. 16 Feb

if not absolutely dishonest.
I distrust the interested
explanation.
Cippsamy should
be reinstated in the
service - the treatment
of the periods during
which he has been
out of employment
as suspension will
far more than adequate
punish any fault
of temper (losing temper)
or judgment he may
have been guilty of

The enquiry cannot
now be completed - for
no fault of Cippsamy
and he must have the
benefit of the incomplete
vindication of his conduct

The case of Mr. Norfords

dismissed

P. W. D.

Proceedings of the Madras Government,

Under date the

187

Read the following:—

From the Chief Engineer for
Irrigation (Recd. Entry No. D dated
9th April 1875)
G.O. No. 309 A of 3rd February/75-

See Separate Memo
No.

It is abundantly
clear that Mr.

Mr. Forster can direct
the work & irregular.

But this does not
help the Pelt. who

will not be when &
when ordered, and

who told of Mr. Forster

A. Luppensawmy
Moodalliar will be in-
formed that in the op-
inion of His Excellency
the Governor in Council
after perusal of the rep-
ort of the Chief Engineer
Irrigation, he has sig-
nified to prove his char-
acter against Mr. Forster, as
has been most desir-
ably dismissed

dismissed from the Govt.
service for contumacious
and insubordinate con-
duct such as cannot
be tolerated in any
Department of the Govt.
service.

His Excellency in
Council regrets that Mr
Torpor should have laid
himself open to such ac-
cusations as those brought
against him by his neg-
ligence in keeping the
Departmental accounts
of his works, and by
mixing up private in-
terests with public trans-
action.

only to advance
his own interests.
I would remove
the bar to his em-
ployment. But
no more.

Sol
167.

I agree with you in
deciding
that insubordination
must be punished,
independently of the
character of the affair
and its immediate effects.
Yours
W. H. H.

23/1

transactions.
45 Ann.

Sol.

A. Cooper sawing, Modelly, 2/2/75

[Faint, illegible handwritten notes]

127/1

*I think that the weather
disturbance over Mexico
Dr. Christen report comes
11/5 NOL*

2112 A

Govt. of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Mr. J. H. P. P. P.

From

Board

Encl

of 2 July 1875, No. 8094.

Nos. 54A-54B.

A supplementary introduction

to the Overseer - South Arcot

It permitted another trial
as Talook Overseer 3^d Grade
in any other districts but
South Arcot or Salem.. and
~~in his negligence~~ the
accusations brought against
him for his negligence
in keeping the Departmental
Accounts of his works
noticed with dissatisfaction