

(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. <i>627</i>	Press <i>Chennai</i>
B.P. No. <i>7</i>	Mis.
Dated <i>9-3</i>	<i>1876</i> <i>195</i> <i>1876</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
9th March 1876.*

Read the following :—

No. 130. From Mr. J. D. R. DIGHTON; dated 28th February 1876 :—

No. 131. ORDER THEREON, 9th March 1876, No. 627.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 7-A.

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council declines to cancel the sentence of dismissal pronounced against Mr. Dighton in G.O., No. 2,326, of 12th August 1875.

(True Extract.)

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

To Mr. J. D. R. Dighton.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

To His Grace The Most Noble
Richard Plantagenet Campbell
Duke of Buckingham and
Chandos. Governor of the Presi-
dency of Fort St. George and its
dependencies.

The humble Memorial of
James D. R. Dighton late 2nd Grade Over-
seer of the Public Works Department in
charge of the Adony Talook in the dis-
trict of Bellary.

Most Respectfully Sheweth.

That your Memorialist served
the Government for the period of nine
years faithfully and zealously in the De-
partment of Public Works in the capacity
of Overseer and that on the representations
of J. A. Power Conductor and Supervisor in
charge of the Penakoudah Range your
humble Memorialist was dismissed
from the Service of the Government.

2 That your Memorialist had
risen to the rank of 1st Grade Overseer
in the Department and was in expectan-
cy of further promotion when he sum-
marily was reduced to 2nd Grade Overseer

on the representations of Assistant Engineer
Mr Lyon for supposed negligence without
having even been called upon for an
explanation.

3. Your Memorialist humbly
appeals against the order of dismissal
for the following reasons.

A. — That the Order of dismissal
as punishment & is the
offence even if there had
been any offence committed.

B. — That the representations
or charges of the Penakoudah
Range Officer are simple al-
legations without any founda-
tion or reasonable proof
partial & prejudiced; where-
by no Court could conclude
nor any Department finally
and equitably direct dis-
missal.

C. That the correspondence
of the Range Officer bearing
on the subject matter carries
with it a feeling of malice
and determination to strengthen
in by every possible means
the charges brought against
your humble Memorialist.

D. That the explanations

Your humble Memorialist
in self defence have not
received due and deliberate
consideration.

11. That the charges or representa-
tions of the Range Officer as against your
humble Memorialist might be summa-
rized thus

A. Overpayment for re-
moving stones.

B. Collusion with the
Maistry in charge of the
Road.

C. Persuading the Local
Fund Sub-Overseer to alter
his Diaries so as to corres-
pond with the Maistry's Dia-
ries and accounts.

5. That the facts of the 1st charge
as alleged by the Supervisor of the Penakou-
-doh range are as follows.

6. That the Supervisor on looking over
the progress Report ^{of} from Calliandroog to
Elmarapore Road for the month of March
1875 discovered an item of 37,232 Square
yards removing small stones / metal size /
from the road that in the abstract of
the progress Report your humble Memo-
-rialist charged them at the rate of one
pie

five per square yard or a total of Rupees
193-14-8. The excess and exorbitant charge
as discovered by the Supervisor.

7. That the progress Report was
returned to your Memorialist for corrections
and retransmitted stating that there was
no mistake.

8. That the Supervisor to discover
the dishonesty of your humble Memorialist
put into practice a novel experiment
whereby the Supervisor arrived at an in-
fallible conclusion and consequently
your humble Memorialist was destined
to be made a victim.

9. That the facts of the 2^d & 3^d charges
as represented by the Supervisor are as
follows.

10. That as Sub Overseer Subiak
of the local Fund had supervision of this
road; was called upon for an explanation
that Subiak admitted checking the Rolls
in possession of the Maistry with work
done and found them correct then add the
"Supervisor," but he cannot say if others
were substituted afterwards and that
"Mr. Dighton contrary to my orders gave him
no authority over the Maistries and that
the Maistries by Dighton's orders sent
Nominal Rolls and Abstracts direct instead
of through him thereby rendering it

impossible

"impossible to know if the correct Rolls
were sent or not."

11. That the Supervisor next question-
ed the Maistry Ramiak a most timid &
nervous individual from whom it was very
difficult to get the truth; "Nevertheless
the Supervisor elicited sufficient truth
affecting the honesty of your humble
Memorialist."

12. That the Remarks and observa-
tions of the Supervisor regarding the dis-
honesty and fraudulent collusion of
accounts by your humble Memorialist;
carry on their very face their own refuta-
tion and your humble Memorialist res-
pectfully submits whether on reading the
allegations of the Supervisor and connectedly
reading therewith the statements made
by the Local and Sub-Overseer Subiah
and Maistry Ramiak before the Super-
visor in the absence and the transfer of
your humble Memorialist from the
charge of the road from Calliandroog to
Amarapoor; whether those statements
were given under fear and pressure of
the Overseer or the Supervisor.

13. That your humble Memorialist
respectfully draws your Noble Grace's
attention to the explanations submitted

in self defence on the alleged charges of
the Supervisor in charge of the Pensacola
Range wherein your Memorialist has
submitted in reference to the 1st charge
that the rates "removing loose stones" was
arrived at from the existing rates for
like work in the Salvo and that the
location "removing loose stones" as
shown by the Supervisor was inaccurate
in meaning for under that head the re-
moval of an order size stones embedded
in the surface of the roadway was in-
cluded that the rate one pie per square
yard was moderate when considering
the nature of the ground over which the
line was taken. that the soil was of a
rocky nature for the greater portion of
the line of road where work was done
underlying one or two inches of small
quartz pebbles. Moderate size boulders
embedded in a loamy soil all which
had to be removed to obtain a compara-
tively smooth surface that the stones so
removed was more or less spread into the
adjoining fields or pits in obedience to
the orders received from the Range
Officer.

That with reference to the 2^d &
3^d charges your humble Memorialist

denies them in toto and that the statements of the Local Fund Sub Overseers were evidently given under coercion and if they were aware of the fact that their statements made them criminal accomplices, they would negate every word of theirs, and that on the statement of two such men. Your Memorialist should lose his appointment and forfeit his situation and privileges of 9 year's labor is a subject matter which your humble Memorialist places before your grace and Council for consideration.

15. That your humble Memorialist begs to state that he never had any dealings with Maistries or Sub Overseers so as to encourage tampering with their Diaries. By a Circular dated October 1874 the Penakondah Range Officer directed that Maistries &c Diaries should contain information as to number of Coolies employed daily and the detail of work performed during the day. The Sub Overseers and Maistries of the Dharmavaram Taluk though furnished each with a copy of the Circular frequently omitted information regarding number of men and women Coolies worked per day and instead of giving the detail of work performed daily they merely entered total quantities of each description

of work performed per day, and at times omitted to mention the Mile or Miles and furlongs in which these works were executed. When such Diaries were received in the Over-seer's Office they were returned pointing out the omission. Your Memorialist can assert that at no time Sub Overseer Subiah's Diaries were ever handed over to Maistry Ramiah to get them corrected; and that all Diaries from Maistry Ramiah since January or February past through Sub Overseer Gobiah and if he observed anything erroneously inserted in the Maistries' Diaries he could have remarked before countersigning them and forwarding them to your Memorialist and in corroboration of this Statement there will be found a measurement sheet showing the whole works performed on the Amarapur road in the Dharmavaram Talook Over-seer's Office during the months of January, February and March taken by Sub Overseer Subiah and prepared by him with the view of justifying the expenditure that was incurred on the work during his Supervision on the said roads.

16 In conclusion your humble Memorialist begs to submit that the representations of the Range Officer

as against your Memorialist consider
ed in every part of view amount simply
to allegations - legation, saturated with
partiality and injustice and that therefore
your Memorialist should be deprived
of his birth a - appointment and his
future prospects and expectations are
perfectly blighted. Your humble Memo-
rialist respectfully prayeth it should
be the consideration the deliberation
Clemency and the sympathy of your
Most Noble Grace and Council, and
your Memorialist as in duty bound.
Will Ever Pray

James D. Dighton

Dighton House
Mount Road
28th February 1876

Deighton's House
Mount Road. Madras
28th February 1876

From
Mr James D. B. Deighton

To
The Honorable W. Nudleston
Chief Secretary to Government
Port St George.

Sir
I have the honor respectfully to beg
of you, to place the accompanying Memorial
and paper connected with it before
The Most Noble The Duke of Buckingham
and Chandos, Governor in Council, for His
Grace's kind and favorable consideration
I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient and
humble servant,
James D. B. Deighton

E-M-C 9222 Jan 2/56 No 102
Chs 4671/73 with Memo: 3263 28/10/73.
8012 Aug 7/75 No 2326.
Chs 6514/75 with Memo 581 23/10/75.

P. W. 1876 Dept
No 1617

From
Mr J. D. R. Dighton

Dated 28th Feb
Recd 4 March 1876

E. 2. 1. 1

Forwards for favourable
consideration a memorial,
praying to be restored to his
former position, as overseer
in the P.W. Department

Recd 9th March 1876 No 130

Cin 6-3-76

No 627

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 9th March 1876.

Read the following:—

From

Mr J. D. R. Dighton (M.C. dated 28th February/76)

His Grace the
Governor in Council
declined to cancel the
sentence of dismissal
pronounced against
Mr. Dighton in P.O.
No 3326 of 12th August
1875-

G.M.W.

Mr. Dighton with 4 Encls.
17.3.76

11/2
Ctbl. of 1876: Adams.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Mr. J. R. Dighton

10/3

Dated

Issued

Recd

Encl.

G. O. 9 March 1876, No.

627

1102. 130 - 131

W. J. D. Dighton. —

Declining to cancel the
sentence of dismissal at
passed on —