M.R.O. 1—10,006—23-2-50.

(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. 381
~~B.P.~~ No.

Press
Mis.__

1875
Dated 12 — 2 — 195 .

Not to be folded or roughly handled

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

No. 253. Read the following letter from Lieutenant-Colonel R. A. ROBERTS, R.E., Superintending Engineer, Tanjore, to Colonel G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Tanjore, 10th November 1874, No. 1,878 :—

IN reference to G.O., 10th October 1874, No. 2,906, in which it is stated that the facts "as explained by Saminatha Iyer disclose no fraudulent concealment, and that my order supplies no evidence of serious moral delinquency," and that therefore the dismissal by me of Saminatha Iyer is not confirmed, and that he is to be suspended for three months, after which he may be restored, I have the honor to offer the following remarks.

Marked A to M.

2. In his Order, No. 32,* dated 11th June 1873, Major Oakes, then in charge of this district, transferred, on public grounds, Saminatha Iyer from the 2nd Range to the 3rd Range as writer under the Mayaveram Taluq Overseer. In that order Major Oakes says: "I understand that you possess house, lands, etc., in the Mayaveram Taluq; if so, you must report to me about it."

* A.

3. In reply, Saminatha Iyer forwarded, through his Range Officer, the petition,† dated 15th June 1873, wherein he states that he possesses a plantain garden 1½ mahs in extent and a house in Mayaveram, and he "trusts that this garden and house may not be an obstruction to his removal to Mayaveram Taluq, as he is very anxious to be near his poor old mother, etc., etc." He further expresses a desire to serve under an East Indian or European. And Lieutenant Smart, R.E., endorses on this: "I think he has served quite long enough under Mr. Wylie, and it will do him good to be placed under a native." This affords a fair idea of Lieutenant Smart's opinion of the writer.

† B.

4. In reply, Major Oakes in his memorandum‡ No. 207, dated 19th June 1873, directed that "his allocation must be left to the officer in charge of Range No. 3, and that the writer cannot be employed in Mayaveram, as he has property there."

‡ C.

5. It would appear that in spite of this order, the writer managed to get employed in the Mayaveram Taluq, and Major Mead in his memorandum § No. 728, dated 19th December 1873, requests to be informed whether the writer is so employed, and if so, that arrangements be at once made for his transfer.

§ D.

6. In reply, Mr. O'Shaughnessy in his docket ‖ No. 422, dated 7th January 1874, states that the writer is under orders to join another taluq in which he has no landed property.

‖ E.

7. In his letter ¶ No. 28, dated 20th April 1874, Mr. O'Shaughnessy brings to notice that for the convenience of the Overseer (a youth recently arrived from the Civil Engineering College) the writer had been allowed to stay on in the Mayaveram Taluq until the end of the official year; and that while so employed, the

¶ F.

writer had purchased a large amount of land as per statement attached, and that he, Mr. O'Shaughnessy, considered "the purchase of so much land by a writer on 15 Rupees a month suspicious." It will be observed that when the writer first submitted his return, the dates of purchase were omitted; and on the Range Officer's directing him to fill up these dates, the entries then made by him do not agree with the statements contained in his petition, dated 13th June 1874.

8. On receipt of this information, Major Mead in his letter* No. 211, dated 20th May 1874, very properly, as it appears to me, resolved to dispense with the services of Saminatha Iyer, who was accordingly† relieved from duty on the 23rd idem.

* G.

† *Vide* H.

9. In a plausible letter,‡ dated 13th June 1874, the dismissed writer petitions against his discharge, and does not scruple to adduce many false statements in support of his appeal. For instance, he says: "Immediately your honor's petitioner purchased the lands he submitted the required land return with all despatch." This is a deliberate falsehood, for it was only when compelled by the rules of the service to furnish the information at the end of the official year, that the Range Officer became acquainted with the fact of the extensive purchases that the writer had been indulging in while serving in the Mayaveram Taluq.

‡ I.

10. On receipt of this petition, Major Mead was induced by the quibble introduced by the writer, in regard to the writer's being under orders to be moved from Mayaveram, to reconsider his decison, and in his letter § No. 349, dated 18th June 1874, he sent the petition to Mr. O'Shaughnessy for the latter's opinion of the case.

§ J.

11. Before, however, Mr. O'Shaughnessy's reply was received, Major Mead in a second letter,‖ No. 420, dated 7th July 1874, took what appears to me the very ill-considered step of instructing Mr. O'Shaughnessy to re-employ the writer, and on the same date in his endorsement¶ No. 102, he informed the writer, "on reconsideration of your case, I have directed you to be again employed in Nunnilam Taluq." It is evident that by not waiting for the reply, Major Mead was desirous of disposing of the question before giving over charge to me. But there can be no doubt but that, with Mr. O'Shaughnessy's reply before him, the order of the 7th July would never have been issued by Major Mead.

‖ K.

¶ L.

12. Mr. O'Shaughnessy's reply,** No. 149, dated 7th July 1874, was received in this office on the 9th idem, *i.e.*, the day previous to my taking over charge; and it was necessarily one of the first papers placed in my hands for disposal after my so taking over charge. This letter made a great impression on me in regard to the apparently flagrant corruption that must be going on in this district to enable obscure men of the kind under reference to make with such comparative ease such large fortunes; I therefore went carefully through the whole file.

** M.

13. My letter No. 630, dated 15th August 1874, on this subject, and forwarding Mr. O'Shaughnessy's letter No. 165, dated 15th July 1874, objecting to Major Mead's final ruling in this case, is already before Government.

14. The district order, which it appears is also before Government, was only issued by me after a very deliberate and dispassionate consideration of the matter. Here is the case of a writer on small pay finding the means of purchasing land almost wholesale, and systematically neglecting, although called upon to do so, to produce before the Range Officer the documents which, if the purchase of the land had been conducted in a straightforward manner, the writer could have no possible objection to submit to scrutiny. But Major Mead never saw these papers, nor have I, nor has Mr. O'Shaughnessy seen them, as I have already mentioned.

15. In G.O., dated 17th March 1865, No. 741, it is most distinctly laid down that "no officer or subordinate in the Public Works Department shall be permitted, under any circumstances, to hold or acquire lands within the limits of the *range* or the taluq in which he may be employed"; and as in the present instance this rule has been most grossly violated, I think it only right that an example should be made, and it was for this reason that I directed the writer's services to be dispensed with at once.

16. On receipt of the Government Order under notice, I sent it to Mr. O'Shaughnessy with a request that he would report on the writer's qualifications, for I am not acquainted personally with the writer; in fact, he has never been near me.

17. In his reply, No. 402, dated 29th October 1874, Mr. O'Shaughnessy reports: "I consider Saminatha Iyer qualified for the appointment of Taluq Overseer's writer, but I have always suspected him of trickery with Contractors and Road Maistries, and of combining with Overseers of doubtful honesty under very suspicious circumstances, especially in the Combaconum Taluq, where on more than one occasion serious discrepancies were attributed to the 'hand-mistake' of the writer's, and this was my principal reason for protesting against the writer's transfer to this range last year."

18. The above character may not be very flattering to the writer, but it is suggestive enough of the serious moral delinquency of the writer's practices. Slippery and unscrupulous men of this stamp are by no means easy to lay hold of, and when therefore they commit a flagrant breach of the rules of the service, punishment should be meted out to them with full measure; as the Tamil Proverb says "for a small snake a thick stick."

19. I trust that I have said sufficient to justify my action in this matter. I regret that the Government should have accepted as correct the statements contained in the writer's petition to Government without referring it to me for report. But as I have now said all that I wish to say in regard to a man whom I have reason to consider to be thoroughly unscrupulous, I beg that if the Government should still decide to retain him in the service, they will be pleased to remove him to another district. Mr. O'Shaughnessy particularly requests that the writer may not be sent back to his range, and I can conceive of no other Range Officer in this district desiring the writer's services. In fact, the retention of a man

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

of the kind in the district is a direct incentive to others to turn their energies to illicit profits, when they find that such can be done with almost impunity.

No. 254. ORDER THEREON, 12th February 1875, No. 381.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 21.

HIS EXCELLENCY the Governor in Council is of opinion that, considering Major Mead had cancelled his dismissal of the man, and the acting officer had only recommended his removal to another taluq, the Superintending Engineer might well be content to dispose of the matter in conformity with their views.

2. Colonel Roberts is at liberty to arrange for his transfer to another district by exchange.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Enginneer, Tanjore.
" Controller, Public Works Accounts.

Public Dep
Mardudason

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
29th January 1875.

No. Read the following:—

From the Superintending Engineer, Tanjore, dated 10th November 1874, No. 1,878.

ABSTRACT.—Offering certain remarks in regard to the dismissal of Writer Saminatha Iyer, and requests that he may be transferred to another district.

No. ORDER THEREON, 29th January 1875, No.

ESTABLISHMENT, No.

HIS EXCELLENCY the Governor in Council is of opinion that, considering Major Mead had cancelled his dismissal of the man, and the acting officer had only recommended his removal to another taluq, the Superintending Engineer might well be content to dispose of the matter in conformity with their views.

2. Colonel Roberts is at liberty to arrange for his transfer to another district by exchange.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

Exd. A. Grubert.

Saminatha Iyer.—Passing orders on the subject of his dismissal, and Colonel Roberts to arrange for his transfer to another district by exchange.

No 1878 Superintg Engineers Office
Tanjore 10th November 1874

From

Lieut Colonel R. A. Roberts RE
Superintending Engineer
Tanjore

To

Colonel G. W. Walker RE
Secretary to Government DPW
Madras

Sir,

The enclosures 13 marked A to M.

In reference to G. O. 10th October 1874 No 2906 in which it is stated that the facts "as explained by Saminatha Iyer disclose no "fraudulent concealment and that my order supplies no Evidence of serious moral delinquency" and that therefore the dismissal by me of Saminatha Iyer is not confirmed, and that he is to be suspended for 3 months,

after

after which he may be restored. I have the honor to offer the following remarks.—

2 In his order, No 32 * dated 11th June 1873, Major Oakes then in charge of this District transferred on public grounds, Saminatha Iyer from the 2d Range to the 3d Range as Writer under the Mayavern Talook Overseer. In that Order Major Oakes says "I understand "that you possess house, lands &ca "in the Mayavern Talook. So you must report to me about it."

* A

D C

3 In reply Saminatha Iyer forwarded through his Range Officer the Petition * dated 15th June 1873, wherein he states that he possesses

* E

C. —

a

a plantain Garden 1½ mahs in extent "and a house in Mayavern, and he "trusts that this Garden and house may "not be an obstruction to his removal "to Mayavern Talook, as he is very "anxious to be near his poor old "Mother &ca &ca." — He further expresses a desire to serve under an East Indian or European. And Lieutenant Smart &c. endorses on this * "I think he has "served quite long enough under Mr "Wylie, and it will do him good "to be placed under a Native." This affords a fair idea of Lieutenant Smart's opinion of the Writer.

4. In reply, Major Oakes in his Memo No 207 dated 19 June 1873

1873 directed that "his allocation "must be left to the Officer in charge "of Range No 3, and that the Writer "cannot be employed in Mayaverm, "as he has property there."

5. It would appear that in spite of this order the writer managed to get employed in the Mayaverm Yalook, and Major Mead in his Memo No 428 dated × D 19th December 1873 requests to be informed whether the writer is so employed, and if so that arrangements be at once made for his transfer.

6. In reply Mr O'Shaughnessy in his Docket No 422 dated 7th × E January 1874, states that the Writer

Writer is under orders to join another Yalook in which he has no landed property.

7. In his letter × No 28 dated 20th April 1874 Mr O'Shaughnessy brings to notice that for the convenience of the Overseer (a youth recently arrived from the Civil Engineering College) the Writer had been allowed to stay on in the Mayaverm Yalook until the end of the Official year, G * and that while so employed, the Writer had purchased a large amount of land as per Statement attached, H * and that he Mr O'Shaughnessy considered the purchase of I * "so much land by a Writer on 15 Rs

"Rupees 20 month Suspicious." It will be observed that when the Writer first submitted his return, the dates of purchase were omitted; and on the Range Officer's directing him to fill up these dates the entries then made by him do not agree with the Statements contained in his Petition dated 13th June 1874.

8. On receipt of this information Major Mead in his letter* No 211 dated 20th May 1874 very properly as it appears to me resolved to dispense with the services of Saminatha Iyer* who was accordingly relieved from duty on the 23rd idem.

*G

*vide H

9. In a plausible letter* dated

*I

dated 13th June 1874, the dismissed Writer petitions against his discharge and does not scruple to adduce many false statements in support of his appeal. For instance, he says "Immediately your honor's "petitioner purchased the lands he "submitted the required land "Return with all dispatch." This is a deliberate falsehood, for it was only when Compelled by the rules of the service to furnish the information at the end of the Official year, that the Range Officer became acquainted with the fact of the extensive purchases that the Writer had been indulging in, while

while serving in the Mayaverm Yalook.

10. On receipt of this Petition, Major Mead was induced by the quibble introduced by the Writer in regard to the Writer's being under orders to be moved from Mayaverm, to reconsider his decision, and in his letter No 349 dated 18th June 1874, he sent the Petition to Mr O'Shaughnessy, for the latters opinion of the Case. * J

11. Before however Mr O'Shaughnessy's reply was received, Major Mead in a second letter No * K

11 *

L

No 420 dated 7th July 1874, took what appears to me the very ill considered step of instructing Mr O'Shaughnessy to re-employ the Writer, and on the same date in his endorsement No 102 * he informed the Writer "on re-Consideration of your Case, I have directed you to be again employed in Nunnilam Yalook." It is evident that by not waiting for the reply Major Mead was desirous of disposing of the question before giving over charge to me. But there can be no doubt but that with Mr O'Shaughnessy's reply before him the order of the 7th July would never have been issued by Major Mead.

12

12. Mr. O'Shaughnessy's reply No. 149, dated 7th July 1874. – was received in this Office on the 9th idem, i.e. the day previous to my taking over Charge; and it was necessarily one of the first papers placed in my hands for disposal after my so taking over Charge. This letter made a great impression on me, in regard to the apparently flagrant Corruptions that must be going on in this District to enable obscure men of the kind under reference to make with such Comparative ease such large fortunes. I therefore went carefully through the whole file.

* M. —

13. My Letter No. 630 dated 15th August 1874 on this subject and forwarding Mr. O'Shaughnessy's letter No. 165 dated 15th July 1874, objecting to Major Meade's finding & ruling in this Case, is already before Government.

14. The District Order, which it appears is also before Government, was only issued by me after a very deliberate and dispassionate Consideration of the matter. Here is the Case of a Writer on small pay finding the means of purchasing lands almost wholesale and systematically neglecting, although called upon to do so, to produce before the Range Officer the documents which, if the purchase

purchases of the land had been conducted in a straightforward manner, the Writer could have no possible objection to submit to scrutiny. But Major Mead never saw these papers nor have I, nor has Mr O'Shaughnessy seen them, as I have already mentioned.

15. In G. O. 17th March 1865, No 41, it is most distinctly laid down that "no Officer or Subordinate "in the P.W. Department shall be "permitted, under any circumstances, "to hold or acquire lands within the "limits of the Range or the Talook "in which he may be employed". And as in the present instance this rule

has

has been most grossly violated, I think it only right that an example should be made, and it was for this reason that I directed the Writer's services to be dispensed with at once.

16. On receipt of the C. P. under notice I sent it to Mr O'Shaughnessy with a request that he would report on the Writer's qualifications, for I am not acquainted personally with the Writer, in fact he has never been near me.

17. In his reply No 402, dated 29th October 1874, Mr O'Shaughnessy reports "I consider Saminatha Iyer "qualified for the appointment of Taluq "Overseer's Writer, but I have always

suspected

"suspected him of trickery with Contractors
"and Road Masters, and of combining
"with Overseers of doubtful honesty
"under very suspicious circumstances,
"especially in the Combaconam Taluq,
"where on more than one occasion
"serious discrepancies were attributed
"to the "hand mistakes" of the Writer;
"and this was my principal reason
"for protesting against the Writer's
"transfer to this Range last year."

18. The above character
may not be very flattering to the Writer,
but it is suggestive enough of the
serious moral delinquency of the
Writer's practices. Slippery and

unscrupulous

unscrupulous men of this stamp are
by no means easy to lay hold of, and
when therefore they commit a flagrant
breach of the Rules of the service
punishment should be meted out
to them with full measure. As the
Tamil Proverb says "For a small
snake a thick stick."

19. I trust that I have said
sufficient to justify my action in this
matter. I regret that the Government
should have accepted as correct the
statements contained in the Writer's
Petition to Government without referring
it to me for report. But as I have
now said all that I wish to say
in regard to a man whom I have

reason

reason to Consider to be thoroughly unscrupulous. I beg that if the Government should still decide to retain him in the service they will be pleased to remove him to another District. Mr O'Shaughnessy particularly requests that the Writer may not be sent back to his Range and I can conceive of no other Range Officer in this District desiring the Writers services. In fact the retention of a man of the kind in the District is a direct incentive to others to turn their energies to illicit profits, when they find that such can be done with almost impunity

I have

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient St.

Ricd. A. Roberts Lieut. Col.
Superintending Engineer
Tanjore

P.W. 1874 Department
[illegible] Feby
No. 7130.
The Supdg Engineer
Tanjore
To the Secretary to Govt
P.W.D.
No. 1878
Dated 10th } November 74
Recd. 13th }
Enclosures. 13.

Offering certain remarks in regard to the dismissal of Writer [illegible] then [illegible], that he may be transferred to another district

G.O. No. 381. 12-2-75.

Ch 253

Cir 8-1-75
[illegible] Coonoor 13 Nov/74

1/2/75.

P. W. D. 3/10

Proceedings of the Madras Government,
Under date the 187

Read the following:—

381

From
The Supdt. Engr. Tanjore (A.E. No 1878 of 10th Novr/74)

His Excellency the Governor in Council is of opinion that, considering ~~that~~ Major Meade had cancelled his dismissal of the man, and ~~that~~ the Acting Officer had only recommended his removal to another Taluq, the Superintending Engineer might well be

M.R.O. 1—

content to dispose of
the matter in conformity
with their views -

1st add

Col Roberts is
at liberty to arrange
for his transfer
by written [illegible]
my Ex [illegible]

[illegible] 6-1-75

To the D. C. Panjab State Rly
— Controller of P. W. A/c

Deptt 13-2-75

7130

Govt. of 1875 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The Supg Engr.
Tanjore

Dated

Recd. 5 p.m. 1-2-75

Encl.

G. O. 12 Feb 1875, No. 1875-587

Nos. 253-254.

Sammiatha Iyer

Passing orders on the report of his dismissal
by Coll. Roberts to
arrange for his transfer
to another district by
[illegible] —