

(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. 1467	(14)	Press Mis.
Dated 5-11-	1877.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

15

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

5th November 1877, No. 1,467 W.

General.
Establishment.

Read the following papers:—

✓ No. 56. Petition from T. RUNGASAWMY PILLAY, late Sub-Overseer, Tanjore District, dated 1st October 1877.

No. 56-A. From the District Engineer, Tanjore, dated 29th October 1877, No. 1,841.

No. 57. ORDER THEREON, 5th November 1877, No. 1,467 W.
AFTER due inquiry into the petitioner's case, the Government decline to interfere on his behalf,
(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

To the District Engineer, Tanjore.
" Petitioner.

Exd. A. S. Rodgers.
Spare Copies

92

No 44.

24 May 77

To

The Taluk, messrs
Kangapattam

Sir

With reference to your letter
of 4th May, the honor to
inform you that in paras.
6 & 7 of Range Memo. No. 11
of 7.5.77. is clearly stated
that you will have charge of
whole Taluk, while work in
the Canal is in progress.

Have the goodness
to obey my orders and
give the Taluk messrs
all the information he
asks - you are
very foolish to give the
trouble it can do you
no good & possibly harm.

See no such work of nature
has hitherto allowed me to give
you any trouble.

I have however sent by our
some estimates that you
57. J. Minikay may give your early attention
to them.
7-6-77.
Retained.

I also enclose copies of
Progress reports of work added
with yours for the time being.

Yours
57. M. Kungasappa
S. K. M. S.

No. 154

Kangapattam Division Office
Kangapattam 19 June 1877
Camp Kungapattam 20 - 80

From

Lieut. J. J. Ronnelly R. E.
Assistant Surgeon
Kangapattam

To

Captain R. R. C. Brochman R. E.
District Surgeon
Tanjore

Sir

I have the honor to report as follows
upon Sub Quereen J. Kungasamy Pelay, whom
I consider utterly unfit for his post.

Some months back I considered it
advisable to remove him from Kungapattam
Taluk to Kangapattam Taluk as there was already
a Supervisor and Quereen there, and (he having
been put back to his permanent appointment
of Sub Quereen) I placed him under the orders
of Quereen Chinnasamy Sengam. He then gave
me a good deal of trouble in his bearing towards
the Taluk Quereen whose authority he was
disposed to resent in every possible way,
and after several times severely reprimanding
him, I gave him sole charge of a portion
of the Taluk. On 15 of last month I sent
orders

orders to the Salug Querser and Rungasany Pilly that the latter was to be placed in charge of the Canal clearing and at the same time retain charge of certain specified works in the vicinity, while the Salug Querser took over charge of the whole Salug. Here again Rungasany Pilly gave a deal of unnecessary trouble and at last I had to interfere on the Salug Querser showing me the enclosed letter that he received in answer to one from him asking for certain records and information which Rungasany Pilly refused to give up.

Placed in charge of the Canal he did scarcely any thing. For some time I could not get the returns of balug sent to me as I ordered, and my written instructions regarding the method to be observed in balug were disregarded. Later on I sent careful written instructions regarding clearing the silt by the Canal establishment and on visiting the Canal soon after I found he had done next to nothing, & what he had done was being done just as

45
as I had said it was not to be done. Later however I have come upon a much more serious piece of disobedience. Rungasany Pilly was in charge of the Pandasyaur before 15th May and while so under my orders he framed certain estimates for straight cut and removing spurs in the river, and also for repairs to the numerous protective works in the River. On 17th March I had ordered him to meet me to mark out these cut. When I arrived at the River I found he had brought no canals, no pegs, no means of marking in fact, and as my camp had moved over night, and I had no shelter within 19 miles I was obliged to push on, and so I pointed out to him how the cut were to be placed, told him what I wanted done and believed he quite understood it all. A contractor could not be got until late in April. During the whole of May almost I was away in Intrapoondy Salug. I had purposed visiting the Pandasyaur about 20th May, but the heavy rains of 16th, 17th, 18th upset my arrangements and I could not get back as soon as I intended. I visited the River

River on 14, and found three cuts complete one nearly finished. One I have no fault to find with. One clause in the specification is "the earth is on" "no account to be left on the padugais but is to" "be used to make up the banks & fill up behind" "pyrgies and mud walls in the vicinity."

What I found was this: the spoil was being pitched away into the river, and at one cut which Rungasamy Pillay had measured & submitted a Certificate for the spoil had been used to make stop banks across the present course of the river. The Sub Quersur acknowledges that he ordered this to be done in order as he says to turn the course of the river into the new cut. Now I mean in any way gave authority for such a proceeding. The waterway given to the cut is not great, and I mean intended that the present course should be blocked up yet & to prevent the spoil being left in the river. I stated in the specification that it was not to be left on the padugays. At a cut at Segan I found the same thing being done, and as the Contractor says according to the Sub Quersur's orders,

but

but I arrived in time to stop it. At another cut the spoil has been thrown in front of the pyrgies in one case so as to break one down, the present course strongly blocked up and I have been obliged to set the River Ameen to work with a squad of Coolies to widen the cut so as to give increased waterway to render it safe. I cannot come down on the contractors for they say Rungasamy Pillay ordered this to be done, and it does not appear that he gave them copies of my specifications which forbid it. As he ordered the obstruction of the present course in some cases by his own confession I think it probable he did so in the others, and he had no authority of any kind from me to do so, and my written orders as to the disposal of the spoil.

I think Rungasamy Pillay ought to be medically examined as to his fitness for the department. His manner is so strange at times and his answers to questions put to him so curious that I am inclined to think he is a little off his head.

Jf

If he remains here, I shall take all
responsibility out of his hands and simply
use him to measure work and make surveys
where he can at least do no damage.

A severe reprimand from your office
accompanied by a fine and for future of
double horse allowances may have some effect.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant.

F. J. Russell Lieut. R. E.

Asst. Surg. U. S. Army
Knappton

If he remains here, I shall take all
responsibility out of his hands and simply
use him to measure work and make survey.

To Messrs. J. N. Pillay
No. 1025 dated 23/6/77.

Nagapattinam Division Tanjore District

From

The Officer in Charge

Nagapattinam Division

Nagapattinam

To

The District Magistrate

Tanjore

Dated 20th } June 1877
Rec^d - }

No. 154

Enclosures one

Report on Sub. Officer J.
Narasimham Pillay that he must
be fined and severely reprimanded.

Let Narasimham
27 June 1877

1437

No. 1025
23 June 77
J. N. Pillay

Docket

Sub. Officer J. Narasimham
Thro' the Officer in Charge
No. 3 Nare.

Forwarded to Sub.
Officer J. Narasimham Pillay
for such explanation as
he may wish to offer.
of N. N. Mothman Captain
District

1 Letter from
No. 3 Nare Officer
No. 154, dated 20th
June 77 with
1 Enclosure
2 Police returned

If he remains here, I shall take all
responsibility out of his hands and simply
use him to measure work and make survey

To. Nengamanna Dilla

Nagapattinam Division Tanjore District

No. 1025

No. 1025

J. Nengamanna
Sub Engineer

N. 78 Valangudi
27 June 1877

To. Captain R. R. E. Brockman
District Engineer
Camp E.

Sir,
With reference to 1/2
part of the Range Officer's
letter No. 154, I have no ex-
planations to offer except
that it should be consid-
ered a special service
in the Nagapattinam and
refer while in such service
to Colonel C. A. R. S. S. S.
placed on record of my
conduct and qualification
I have executed many
surveys & levels and
Lieut. Romo himself
has given a fair report
of my knowledge of survey.
It is known to your
honour that after my
having been degraded from
ag. 1st class over tier & 1st
over tier 1st grade for

He understands
surveying & survey
J. N.

and it is decided in the last
and it is decided in the last

For no cause whatever on my part. I
was placed under Salary Mexican
- Salary Lyngan. Your honor is aware
that the Lab workers 1st Grade in all
other Ranges of the District are not
placed under Salary workers of some
months standing in the Department.

Besides this your honor is aware
 that Col. Aker intended giving
 Pierpont's appointment in 9th opportunity
 and after all, Chinnaamy Iyengar
 got first in your honor's time
 how it is possible that I should be
 under him, after having been under
 other officers since Col. Mullins & Aker.
 & Major Read &c. And many other off-
 of long standing.

The Range officer says on account of disagreement between me and Chenna of Larry Sprager, he gave me a portion of the Salug. He had also given me a portion of the Salug while in Pictapondy. He has not done this arrangement on account of disagreement between me and Lab. The Range officer has not charged of duties.

The agreement between the
The Range Office & the latter
part of the 2^d para of the letter the

I did not give information to Dr. Channing
- Henry Sprague: and to which I beg to enclose
Copies of my letters for your Honor's perusal
and also beg to enclose a letter from him
asking whole records of my office.

When I had to take charge of portion
of Laing from the Geiger I never received
any thing but Estimates & Station books
connected with such portion & I received
no information whatever nor has he shown
me any work especially at the working
Season & before the close of the African
Year.

The Range Officer says that my
having been placed in charge of Canal
Clearing I did nothing, & which, I
begin to state that the Canal was not
done he handed up on the 1st April then
the work was under Chennarayana
and heeling was going on until 1st Nov.
4-15 days. Now I have taken
charge of the Canal which is on the
15th May and before I began to clear
the Canal with the sanctioned estimate
of Rs. 4,100, The rain prevailed & filled
up the Canal and the Range Officer
wants I bale out water and which
took from 22nd of June, this was effe-
cted in Shalir. And in less expense
than

than before. As soon as receipt
of orders & Commence work, I immediately
set up work with a few coolies of Canal
Establishment then present and a
Report on the insufficiency of the allowed
was brought to his notice and upon favorable
orders on my letter, I have pushed on with
work with about 60 to 100 coolies besides
with Canal Establishment. And in order
to complete the work in time, I have requested
that the every 1/4 mile be given on contract
to those who are habitual in such work

and some of the Contractors were sent to the Range Officer in his permission or sign a bond
they were called petty contractors and not taken in. These Contractors can take 1 mile or 2 miles at a time but they are afraid that the Canal be filled up with water by rain and that they will lose by the Contractor if taken more miles.

They refused to pay deposit or sign a bond and feel justified in not doing so. They would be commenced with suit some day.
J.P.R.

The Range Officer states again in the 3rd para that he never got return of being for sometimes. It is not my mistake but that of Canal Establishment. I keep a return of being and the delay cleared on account of him. In the meantime one of the works in Pondanayar, the Range Officer

I simply state that I have brought no Cavalgar and pegs marks on the work on the 17th March. The letter accompanying Pondanayar Estimates reached me on the 16th March late and I had to meet the Range Officer on the 17th March at Proddor. pathoor and I was unable to procure pegs so I took a tunicor & order any Cavalgar to be present on the work spot. Even they are not under my immediate order. The Range Officer states in the letter that a Contractor could not be got until late in April & which I beg I enclose Lami Copy of the Contractor written on the 2nd March and one of the work is finished in time and measured on the 27th April and another in Andagody Lami on 10th May 77. The Range Officer appears to find fault with work at Proddor. pathangoody while in progress and that at Ligar. The first work was in progress and I rectified the same a little gradually. And the second work the Contractor should only marked out work and before it is full or partial depth of the work I was at Delangun looking after the Canal work. The Estimate for Pondanayar protective works

to 24. 7. 26.
in 27. 7. 26.
Gen. & my
orders about
spot above
marked

No copy of the Estimate was presented to the Contractor. I have only marked out work and before it is full or partial depth of the work I was at Delangun looking after the Canal work. The Estimate for Pondanayar protective works

As the work is ordered by the Government I am not responsible for the delay in the work.
J.P.R.

done

were sent & over-her, Chennasamy Iyengar
immediately after the receipt of an order
from the Range Officer on 10 May, he is Chennasamy
alone responsible after that date and the removal
of J. I believed that the Contractor ^{was} ⁱⁿ ^{the} ^{river}
were induced & tell again to me as I found a ^{proper}
am away from the charge of that work ^{across} ^{the} ^{old}
suppose that I have done some ^{work}
mistake in allowing the Contractor
& throw up Spoil no where but in
the padroga or in the river, the Iyengar
would have rectified the mistake
or report would have been made in
time. He has not done so, he wants
to implicate others in his fault.

I did not order to throw up all the
earth for cross bank but to cluster
bank behind the Madasil & Gouge ^{and} ^{to} ^{make} ^{the} ^{bank}
and to make bank. I am the person ^{who} ^{framed} ^{the} ^{Estimates} ^{for} ^{defensive}
works on the order of the Range Officer
and would have misunderstood of my
own Estimates. I did give order to
shut up old course of the river & ^{to} ^{make} ^{the} ^{bank}
give immediate effect, after the fact ^{that} ^{the} ^{depth} ^{is} ^{drag} ^{up}
depth is drag up. I received no ^{positive}
order either to close the old course
or keep it open. I heard that the one
at the Siger limit was in danger.
St. L.

He states
he did give
such orders
in one case.

115
St. L. and the Range Officer beg an
Stop the breach being ^{otherwise} ^{accident} to the
break bank and it is not my fault
and I know nothing about the cross
bank nor have I ordered the Contractor
I am long time in Tanjore District
and I have framed many Estimates
of Protective & Defensive works and
which will not lead me to do so.
In Conclusion I respectfully beg to
bring to your honor's kind notice that
in the first para, he calls me unfit
for the post and in concluding para
the Range Officer recommends for
me, for future of trouble, for all
concern and does not recommend me
your honor's office and he turns me
me every other respect. Your honor
will be pleased to consider whether
he intend to ruin my future pros.
he intend to ruin my future pros.
He has once
told me that before I get transfer
ed, he will report me badly and
I cannot bear his ill treatment and
abusive language and I beg that I
may be transferred to another Range
and I also beg to send original letters
from Chennasamy Iyengar the
indulgence he has got over me.
I have any grounds for complaining
of his treatment.

J. Leg. J. Remann

John Robertson & Son

Williamson & Co.
Labourers 12 Jan & 27th

order of
the
magistrate

Officer in Charge
The Range Officer

Dec. 3. 1897

Dec. 3. 1897

Dec. 3. 1897

Dec. 3. 1897

Dec. 3. 1897

Dec. 3. 1897

1437 - 1532

Docket

No. 1121

2nd July 77

The Officer in Charge

No. 31 Aug.

Your letter No. 154 dated 27 June 77
and the District Engineer's
Pillay's explanatory letter thereon
dated 27 June 1897.

The District Engineer having
read the above carefully is of opinion
that Nungasamy Pillay has ever
since his appointment to the Negapa-
tam Range worked very misad-
-factorily and has failed to conduct
his duties harmoniously and with
due regard to the interests involved
in the responsible work devolving
on him. He is egotistical in the extreme,
extremely sensitive & takes offence
forgetting that much should be
endured by a subordinate in
his position in order that no delay
or obstruction may be caused
to the prosecution of Government
work. The District Engineer will
not dispense with the services

of Nungasamy Pillay on this occasion, but is willing to give him one more chance. He accordingly directs that he be transferred to No. 4 Nange & work in the Putterotta Taluk vice Sub Overseer Agnesamy Pillay who will take Nungasamy Pillay's place in No. 3 Nange. Agnesamy Pillay will be directed to move first with the least possible delay. The Officer in Charge No. 4 Nange will be furnished with a copy of this order.

Signed R.R. Brockman Capt. M.L.
District Engineer

True Copy Communicated to the Officer in Charge No. 4 Nange for information. He is requested to submit a monthly report upon Nungasamy Pillay's work & his conduct. R.R. Brockman Capt. M.L.
District Engineer

2^d July 1877

No. 1205
19 July 77
Velampudi 2

+ kept in file
Docket (under file)
The Officer in Charge
No. 3 Nange

Reference -

Under the circumstances brought to notice in the Nange Officer's letter No. 198 dated 13 instant relative to the most unsatisfactory manner in which Sub Overseer Nungasamy Pillay has performed work of clearing the Vadamiyam the District Engineer considers the retention of that subordinate for any further period in Government employ will be detrimental to Government interests and he has resolved therefore to dismiss him from date of his applying for sick leave. Sub Overseer Agnesamy Pillay has been ordered to join the Regapatam Nange at once. Copies of the Nange Officer's letter No. 198 and of this order should be furnished to Sub Overseer Nungasamy Pillay.
R.R. Brockman Capt. M.L.
District Engineer

Questions.

1. Were you ordered to commence clearing the Canal from BTR 27 to BTR 29, or ~~more~~?

2. Were you told to complete one take fully before another take was commenced

3. Were you ordered to report when the first take assigned to you was approaching completion?

4. Were you told to continue working beyond BTR 29 without further orders?

5. Were you told to place the Bed at a uniform level of 85.00 & to obtain the level of the bed at the different sections by stretching a cord from BTR 1 to BTR or peg to peg the levels of

W. H. H. H.
W. H. H. H.
W. H. H. H.
W. H. H. H.

No. 1205

W. H. H. H.

No. 3 & 4 9/10

No. 1121

136

which were marked
for you on the sections,
to ascertain what depth
below the stage the ex-
cavation was to be carried

in order to give a level
of 85.00. Were you told

to give the required depth
to be dug so far as to

writing to the Museum?

Did you tell the Museum the

depth?

6. Were you told to do

your work in talks, sub-

dividing the big talks

marked out by the

section pages on B.M. with

smaller ones according

to the number of workers

you could get?

7. Were you told to keep

water out of these talks

by bunds?

8. Were you told to ex-

cavate the centre

20 ft. of each talk to the

full depth and width

first, then complete

the sloping & dressing

the sides.

no.

yes

yes

9. Did you do your
work talk by talk in-
fully complete one
before going on to another?
If not, why not?

Because. I started along slopes
work in a reduced rate than
the clearing of bed.

10. Did you report when
you had nearly got
to 85.00? If not,
why? If so, when?

As the work was completed the
by talk.

Did you ascertain
the proper depths in
the way ordered and
give the Museum the
depths in writing?
If not, why not?

after 5 days I ascertained
the depths to the extent and then
unable to give to the Museum
as I was sick.

The work was begun on 10th
June, & the Sub. Overseer offered
to leave before about 1 month
before the test of the
depths.

11. Did you excavate
the centre portion to
the full depth & width?

in the last talk depth
left to be adjusted by
means of levelling & beds it

10/11/1911

13. Did you measure
up the water very
thoroughly?

checked every four days
mainly entire $\frac{1}{2}$ depth and
I took it $\frac{1}{8}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ depth.

14. Did you take any measurements yourself?

Checked Maurice Macmillan

13. And you allow men to
be entered on the State
books at less a day who
do no work, but
bring in a few coals?

with the Beginning - 1870
when I could not cook 8x4.
their sweas - and they are
to procure cookies not less
than 50.

16. Will you allow boys
to be entered at High
Rates?

no. - struck out some
of the water entered by
Amceus -

17. Do you allow a
large number
to come without a permit
to work with their hands?

NO. = all found
with either Basket
or Measuring. or both
I found cheap & cool
working with them
7/12
W. Humphreys

F. J. Rouilly & Co

[Faint handwritten notes and signatures are visible across the page.]

Most Respected Sir,
 I have the pleasure to receive
 of your Honor's Copy of mine of 12th of 17th
 together with the Orange Officers Letter &
 your Honor's to the Orange Officer. I am
 glad to hear that you are well & in the
 right and wish for the full recovery of

[illegible]

I had no idea that it was
 Persecuted only. It was not satisfied of the cause
 and the depth
 required. It was not being pushed on with

I had info with regard to the Coon he was seen
at there. From his report writing in Dec of 1860 & Jan.
1861 it is said he told me that

I told Saml, I changed my mind when I found how badly the work was done. and the work is completed.

N. 230

Nagapattinam Division Office
Vetangumy 31st July 1877

From

Lieut. F. J. Romilly R.E.
Assistant Engineer
Nagapattinam

To

Captain R. H. C. Brockman R.E.
District Engineer
Payore

Sir

With reference to Rungasamy Pillay's letter regarding the clearing of the Vedamium Canal I have the honor to make the following remarks:-
I gave the Sub Engineer written orders to bundle off the Canal in regular baks, and to fully complete each bak before another was commenced. He was ordered to commence at B.M. 27, 28 and complete to B.M. 29, 30 a distance of 440 yards and to send me a report when this was nearly completed. These orders were not obeyed. No report was sent to me, and he went straight ahead to B.M. 31, 32 and instead of completing one bak before commencing another he simply excavated a portion in centre and left the spoil on the slopes all the way down. His

Excuse

W. J. Romilly R.E.
Vetangumy 31st July 1877

13/13
4/8/77

From Sub Engineer

to the District Engineer

Date 25th Aug 77

Recd. (H.)

By the Sub Engineer
to the District Engineer

1263-
[Faint handwritten notes and stamps at the bottom of the page]

His excuse that he had to do this in order that he might not exceed the rate is nonsense - Leaving all that slimy spoil on the slopes, was not only unnecessary but showed utter want of judgement, as by the proceeding a quantity slipped back into the Canal - especially as the sides of the centre excavation were nearly vertical. I have been personally superintending the Canal clearing lately, and the spoil turned out was deposited along the berm and on the following day was in an excellent condition for moving away with mamookies. Saks were marked out proportional to the number of coolies, the full depth and width excavated the first day and the slopes cut and dressed and the Sak completed by the second day. No necessity was experienced for leaving the spoil more than 12 hours on the berm and the rate was 2 as 0/8 p. When I got Rungasamy Pillay's report saying he was doing the work at so low a rate I had no idea that he was only doing half the work, or I should not have said "it was satisfactory". When I inspected the

the work on the 5th with him, I did not discover the wide deficiency in the depth all or I should have reported him then and to there. I was very angry with him for not obeying my orders about carrying on the work by successive Saks, and I do not understand with how he can say I was quite satisfied with what I found going on. However as he appeared to have got his coolies together I did say I would ask permission for him to stay and complete. I gave orders for the slopes at once to be dressed up and when I came again on 9th I took sections and found how very far short of the prescribed depth the excavation had been carried. The sub-Quartermaster had then gone away sick. At Regapattam I sent for him at the Hospital but nothing was known of him as he did not go there and from that day to this I have not seen him. I have since learnt that he never went to Regapattam but was at Kuvature all the time. Had I been able to get

T. Y. Couilly

get hold of the Sub Quartermaster I should have called for his explanation before sending my report about him. In carrying out the Canal work he has shown no care, no forethought, no intelligence and when I visited the work I found a number of irregularities that showed plainly that the departmental supervision was of the slackest description. I found children entered in the station books at rates for grown men, some men

given a daily wage of 4 annas because they brought a few coolies but did no work themselves. One of these I may mention was a

blonde man. At the work I found the silt being cleared by the coolies shying lumps of spoil by hand from one to the other, and as the spoil was of the consistency of pea soup in parts the quantity that eventually found its way to the bank by this method may be imagined.

I cannot find any proofs that the Sub Quartermaster took measurements of his own, and I am told that he merely checked the Amiens measurements every four days. My inspection

report

F.V. 1/10/10

215
report for the month contains various particulars regarding the work which will I think confirm what I regret I have to report against Rungasamy Pillay.

~~E~~ Rungasamy Pillay appears to consider that he has been reported against without sufficient cause. He is so impressed with a sense of his own excellence that nothing would ever make him believe that he is in the wrong. It is a failing of his that I have had to notice before, he believes he is infallible. I have no hesitation in saying that Rungasamy Pillay is utterly unfitted to be in charge of works and is worse than useless as a subordinate in the D.P.W. as from his ideas of his own importance and what is due to his own dignity he gives a vast amount of trouble in official routine.

In conclusion I have to report that I am put to great inconveniences by the manner in which he has gone off without

without giving over charge. He has several
Government instruments in his possession,
and some plans, among others are sketches
for Road 67 which he promised to submit
in May and has not sent in yet.

I have the honor to be

in
Your most obedient servant.

F. J. Poinelly *Leut. R. G.*

Assistant Engineer Regapalam

To F. Rangasamy Pillay
late sub Engineer P.W.

1313
4/8/77

Regapalam District Engineer

From

The Officer in charge
Regapalam District
Regapalam

To

The District Engineer
Bangalore

Dated 31st July 1877

Recd 1st August 1877

N^o 230

Enclosure

Report on Rangasamy Pillay
explanations regarding his dis-
missal

122

F. J. Poinelly

2743

5-10-77

22. Encl.

23

To

His Grace the Most Noble

THE DUKE OF BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS,

Governor of Fort Saint George

and President of the Council thereof;

And to the Hon'ble Members of the said Council.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THOMAS
RUNGASAWMY PILLAI, LATE
SUB-OVERSEER, 1ST GRADE, NEGA-
PATAM TALUQ, TANJORE DISTRICT.

HUMBLY SHEWETH,

1. That your Grace's humble Petitioner begs to lay the following grievances before your Grace in Council, and trusts it will meet with the consideration it deserves, and justice be meted to him, who has been serving for upwards of 12 years in the Public Works Department.

2. That your Grace's Petitioner was employed for several years as a Surveyor in the Tanjore District, under Colonel Oakes, Majors Hasted and Mead, and also as a Taluq Overseer under Colonel Mullins, when that distinguished officer was Executive Engineer at Tanjore. During that time your Petitioner made many road surveys, entered plans in books, and also took surveys and levels for minor irrigation projects, of which Ponnassell Irrigation Project is one. In 1875, Colonel Oakes, on his return from England, was pleased to appoint your Petitioner as Acting Taluq Overseer, *vice* Overseer Puthmanaba Naidoo, who was then on "Leave on private affairs." At that time Mr. J. Hannan made a favorable report, accompanied with a letter from Mr. Baker, as to your Petitioner's fitness for the post of Taluq Overseer; and in reply to this, Colonel Oakes was pleased to issue a Memorandum favorable to your

No. — in reply to No. 562 of
23rd March 1876.

Petitioner. Although your Petitioner was much liked by that officer, still, during his incumbency, he was unable to provide your Petitioner the post of Taluq Overseer, owing to there being no vacant post at the time in his District. But on the eve of his departure he placed on record for his successor's information, to provide your Petitioner with such post when the first vacancy occurs, and moreover introduced your Petitioner to Mr. J. Hannan, then in temporary charge of the district, asking that

Vide No. 1,151 of 2d June 1876.

officer to inform Captain Brockman of Colonel Oakes' intention towards your Petitioner. Captain Brockman, however, appointed your Petitioner as acting Taluq Overseer in the room of Ram Row, who was then under suspension and pending the final orders of Government.

F. V. Conolly/PC

3. Government passed orders that Ram Row should be dismissed from the service, and moreover Captain Brockman on learning that Colonel Oakes had retired from the service, instead of confirming the post on your Petitioner, who was then doing the duties of the acting appointment, sent for one Mr. Morton from Madras, and appointed him as Taluq Overseer, having placed your Petitioner as Sub-Overseer, 1st Grade, in the room of one Muttu Naidoo, who was compelled to resign his post in consequence of certain errors in his levels, &c., by the report of Lieut. Romilly on the matter. The Petitioner not being satisfied of the steps taken by Captain Brockman and Lieut. Romilly, wrote to the latter for the injustice done to your Petitioner. Lieut. Romilly in endorsing your Petitioner's letter, did it very guardedly, but little knowing that Colonel Oakes had placed on record a favorable Memorandum regarding your Petitioner's past conduct and behaviour. However in your Petitioner's endeavors nothing had been done by way of justice, inasmuch they did this for the purpose of favoring Mr. Morton, and your Petitioner was constrained to be satisfied, as the pay of a Taluq Overseer, 3rd Grade, and that of a Sub-Overseer, 1st Grade, is equally the same, only that the Taluq Overseer draws double horse allowance. And on the Range Officer stating that your Petitioner discharges his duties same as a Taluq Overseer, the

No. 24, of 17th March 1877.

Endorsement No. 658, of 18th March 1877.

District Engineer therein endorsed on it that "double horse allowance be drawn to this subordinate." Lieut. Romilly has expressed his opinion in the Annual Report ending 31st March 1877, far better than Mr. Morton, the Taluq Overseer. Since the time Mr. Morton was appointed as Acting Taluq Overseer, in spite of your Petitioner's remonstrances, he was always suffering with ill health. Your Petitioner is given to understand that he is now taken in the District Engineer's Office as Accountant in the room of one Mr. Thomas, promoted and transferred to another District.

4. That your Petitioner while in charge of works in the southern parts of Negapatam Taluq, was grossly abused by Lieut. Romilly on the 1st May last, by words to the effect as "*Lick you up and make you eat the dust.*" That your Petitioner upon this wrote for his transfer to another Range or allow your Petitioner to resign his post, as your Petitioner was unwilling to bear insults without any faults or errors, and to be a witness to Lieut. Romilly's rash act of striking Maistries and others for trivial or no fault, and turning them out and getting fresh ones, and who afterwards get the same treatment.

5. After the occurrence of the above event, your Petitioner was ordered to give over charge of the works in the southern part of the Taluq to Taluq Overseer Chinnasamy Iyengar, instantly, and to continue to proceed on with the Vadarniem Canal work, keeping Petitioner's head quarters at Velangany. Your Petitioner obeyed the orders, and gave over charge of the works, &c., to the said Taluq Overseer.

6. While the canal work was under Chinnasamy Iyengar, baling was going on by means of baskets to empty a canal three miles in distance by two squads placed one at each extremity of the canal. No sooner your Petitioner had taken charge of the works, he effected this by means of picottahs at either extremities, and from the centre of the canal, by which means water was let out of the canal with less expense and more rapidity than that done by Taluq Overseer Chinnasamy Iyengar. The Range Officer was pleased with your Petitioner, although the latter was adverse to obtain orders to such proceeding. Taluq Overseer Chinnasamy Iyengar became jealous at Petitioner's way of proceeding on with the work, and consequently became an enemy to all that your Petitioner did.

7. When Lieut. Romilly had occasion to find fault with some defensive works in Pandiviar river, Chinnasamy Iyengar threw the blame upon your Petitioner. The Range Officer immediately reported the case to the District Engineer, Captain Brockman, calling upon your Petitioner for an explanation. He did so, but at the same time asked the District Engineer to transfer him to another Taluq, as your Petitioner was certain that he would be treated maliciously if he remained further in the Negapatam Range. The District Engineer transferred your Petitioner to Puttucotai, and the order reached him on the 6th July 1877.

8. As the Range Officer failed to get satisfaction in his first attempt, he again reported unfavorably on the 14th July 1877, before your Petitioner left the Range, as per his letter No. 198, herewith attached, and got him dismissed from the service for *disobedience of orders*.

9. Your Petitioner humbly begs that your Grace in Council will be pleased to peruse the Range Officer's Memo., No. 500, dated 30th August 1877, to Sub-Overseer Aginisamy Pillay, and to compare how far the Range Officer's report upon your Petitioner is correct, and the instructions to the Sub-Overseer on the same subject. Lieut. Romilly with the view of doing some injury to your Petitioner, records in the latter part of his letter, para. 3, No. 198, as follows:—

"I cannot rectify this part of the work without exceeding the estimate which is already high enough, and I think the only thing to do is to leave matters as they are, and set the Canal Establishment to dredge this part when the canal is opened."

10. Again, in No. 500, to Sub-Overseer Aginisamy Pillay, he issued orders that the slopes done by the Petitioner need not be disturbed and to go on with the required depth out of the estimate amount and before the canal is opened.

11. It will be seen from this that the estimate could not exceed, nor was there any difficulty in carrying out the work, although the Range Officer ordered Sub-Overseer Aginisawmy Pillay to do this rather late.

12. The Range Officer's reports while your Petitioner was sick, and his statement is set forth in the order of time as follows:—

2nd July 1877.—The Range Officer sent a docket to the Petitioner for his satisfaction to ascertain the rate at which work was turned out (vide copy of his Memo., No. 308, herewith attached).—A.

4th July.—The Petitioner's reply to Range Officer as to how he had effected in reducing the rate, and the process the Petitioner adopted in carrying out the work.—B.

5th July.—The Range Officer inspected the work with the Petitioner, and on the evening sent his instructions regarding the work. Wherein it is not stated that the Petitioner has disobeyed his orders.

The Range Officer had expressed his unwillingness for the Petitioner's transfer to Puttucotai Taluq (as he calls it a beastly Taluq) and asked the Petitioner whether he liked to go there; and the Petitioner said in the affirmative.

6th July.—The Petitioner was sick, which will be seen from the Inspection report of the Petitioner, from 1st to 10th July, dispatched on the 11th July 1877, unknowing to Lieut. Romilly's report on the 14th July 1877.—C.

7th July.—The Petitioner had to go to Negapatam to place himself on sick list, and got admittance, No. 4,027, for diarrhoea.

8th July.—The Petitioner was unable to go out on account of sickness.

9th July.— Do. do. do.

10th July.—The Range Officer inspected the canal works and wanted to see the Petitioner, and if ill to send book sections, papers connected with the canal works, as he wanted to make payments (vide his Demi-official letter).—D. and E.

10th Evening.—The Range Officer having sent his cart to the Petitioner, he was allowed to go in medical list after taking cash book and balance and papers connected with the canal works in the evening.

13. On the 14th, quite unexpectedly, the Range Officer being quite for these days, reported that the Petitioner disobeyed the orders given him on the 5th July, while the Petitioner was on sick list, and was about to be relieved permanently by Sub-Overseer Aginisawmy Pillay. It was believed that after Chinnasawmy Iyengar came in contact with him, the Range Officer made reports against your Petitioner.

14. Your Grace in Council will be pleased to observe the Range Officer's wavering intention in the above as well as in the following few lines :—

The original estimate for clearing the Vadarniem Canal is Rs. 4,100, and the revised estimate by him Rs. 10,000.

For the Original Estimate.—Bottom breadth 24', slope 2 to 1. Depth below low water mark of the canal 5 feet; rate anna (1) per cubic yard.

For the Revised Estimate.—According to partial conformity with the Chief Engineer's instructions on Captain Ryve's model of preparing estimates for channels; bottom breadth 20', slope 3 to 1. Bed is to be at 85'00'; rate annas (3) per cubic yard.

Again he states in one docket that slope 2 to 1 is sufficient and in another 3 to 1. And again reports to the District Engineer, slopes given by the Petitioner is not right; and in another Memo., No. 500, states that the slopes given by the Petitioner is not to be disturbed.

15. The District Engineer, being chief Local Officer, having not taken any steps to verify the truth of the report by actual inspection of the work in question, dismissed your Petitioner and appointed one Soobramia Sastry as Sub-Overseer, 1st Grade, in his room. And now your Petitioner is given to understand that the Sastry is promoted to Taluq Overseer *vice* Mr. Morton, transferred to the District Engineer's Office as Accountant.

16. Your Petitioner had been treated very *unjustly* by being dismissed from the service, for your Petitioner never made any excessive payments on the works turned out, nor exceeded the limited rate as to deserve such condign punishment in order to make room for others. The D. P. W. Code clearly defines that all errors, such as the (if any) made in the cash book, &c., *but not dismissal*.

17. Your Petitioner began to complete the work at less than 2 annas per cubic yard of earth, although the sanctioned rate is 3 annas, and in the measurement taken by Maistries for $\frac{1}{2}$ yard of depth (on an average) your Petitioner curtailed into $\frac{3}{8}$ yards by his checking, and your Petitioner should have been looked upon as honest and trustworthy, but whereas it is otherwise; and if Colonel Oakes was just now in the Tanjore District, he would be able to speak of your Petitioner's honesty from the fact of his having tested your Petitioner's conduct for many years.

18. On the other hand, your Petitioner begged for copies of two letters written to the District Engineer, one as to Petitioner's knowledge of surveying and levelling, and another for double horse allowance. The Range Officer having given one copy and another for double horse allowance, refused to give the other, lest an appeal be made, and thereby his report will go much against his subsequent reports, although directed in endorsement given to the Petitioner by District Engineer.

On the 25th August.

On the day your Petitioner went to ask the copies, he sent for the Service Register and began to alter something in it, which, your Petitioner believes, is something detrimental to his character.

19. Your Petitioner submitted his explanation to the District Engineer, and begged that the work may be inspected as to the truth of the Range Officer compared with Petitioner's, but he was unwilling to inspect the work as it was stated by the Range Officer that the work was done unsatisfactorily.

20. It is an easy matter for the District Engineer to dismiss a poor man without just cause from the public service, but to your Petitioner it is of the greatest consequence, as it leaves a great bar to his future prospects, and that too, after serving Government in the Department for upwards of twelve years.

21. Considering that your Grace's unfortunate Petitioner has no other way of having his grievances redressed, your Petitioner ventures to appeal to your Grace in Council; and your Petitioner humbly and respectfully trusts that your Grace will lend a gracious ear to this his Petition, and thus vindicate your Petitioner's innocence and integrity, and re-instate him in the service, having fallen a victim to honest and faithful labour rendered in the interests of Government.

For which act of justice, your Petitioner, as in duty bound,

SHALL EVER PRAY.

T. Rungasawmy Pillay
Late Sub-Overseer, 1st Grade.

MADRAS, 1st October 1877.

Petitioner's Address—

T. RUNGASAWMY PILLAY.

Tom Street, No. 3, adjoining Poodcopett,
MADRAS.

Referred to the
District Engineer
Tanjore for report.

G. D. M. L. E.
Secy to Govt. P. W. D.

11th October 1877

Transferred (with
enclosures) to the Chief
Engineer, & Secretary
to Government, Public
Works Department.

(By order)
Major
Military Secretary
to His Highness the Governor

Military Secretary's office
Government of Madras
2nd October 1877

4653 hrs/p, 12 to 50

3/10 1877

All the enclos are returned
to the Govt. P. W. D.

Referred

Name of Officer.		Caste or Race.	Residence.	Name.	Residence.	Date of birth.	Age.		Exact Height.		Personal marks for identification.	Date of Entry.	Signature of Officer.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office.
Years.	Mos.	Days.	Feet.	In.	Years.	Mos.	Days.	Feet.	In.					
Thomson, Rungarao, P. W. D.		Hindoo - Christian.	Madras	D. Rungarao, P. W. D.	Madras	1st December 1840.	35	11	5	5	A mole in the right side of chin.			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Name of appointment.	Nature, i.e., whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.
Sub. Overseer 2 nd Class, 3 rd grade Pollachy Range, Coimbatore Distt.	Sub. stantive	"	25	"	15 th Augt 1862	

Tanjore District Maipveram Talug Overseer	"	"	60	"	Sep 32 nd 3 rd June 1864	Mannar Rungasawmy
--	---	---	----	---	--	-------------------

Talug Overseer Mannargoooy	"	"	"	"	"	"
-------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---

8	9	10	11	12
Character of Officer. No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.	Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	Date of termination of appointment.	Reason of termination e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
The bearer T. Rungasawmy served under me for a short time when I was in charge of the Pollachy Range, Coimbatore District and gave great satisfaction by the intelligent manner in which he discharged the duties entrusted to him. (Signed) A. C. Crawford By Engineer, 3 rd grade Upper Anicut 7 th February 1867		31 st March 1863.	All Sub. Over. see abolished in course of the re-organization of the Department.	
Overseer Rungasawmy joined the Range 9 th of June 1864. He has but little practical knowledge and I regret to add has shown a great want of activity and zeal in his work. (Signed) H. P. Mead Asst Engineer 23 rd Novr 1864.				
Overseer Rungasawmy did not give me satisfaction. He was always inattentive and inert. (Signed) W. F. Donaghue Supervisor 3 rd June 1865 Tanjorebar				Transferred to Mannargoooy.
				Transferred to Trichinopoly Distt.
				Transferred to Kallitalay Trichy Distt.
		31 st May 1866	Resigned	

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, i.e., whether substan- tive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allow- ance.	6 Date of ap- point- ment.	7 Signature of Officer.
Acting Clerk, Supr. Engrs. Office Majore	Acting	"	20	"	1 st July 1866	
Asstt Accountant and Writer in No. 4 of Knapalam Range	Sub- stantive	"	25	"	1 st March 1867	
"	Substan- tive	"	"	"	"	
Local Fund Overseer	Do.	"	60	"	18 th July 1868	Thomas Kungumayy, D.
Surveyor	Temporary	"	50	"	23 rd June 1869	
"	"	"	50	"	1 st Octr 1871	
Surveyor, L. F. Roads	"	"	60	"	1 st Aprl 1872	
Taluk Overseer Mayaveram	Acting	"	60	"	28 th Novr 1875	
Do Tiruppoondy	Permanent	"	60	"	28 th June 1876	

8 Character of Officer. No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.	9 Signature & designa- tion of im- mediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termina- tion of ap- pointment.	11 Reason of ter- mination e.g., transfer, pro- motion, return of permanent incumbent.	12 Signature and desig- nation of immediate head of the Office.
Rungasawmy joined the 4 th Range Office as asstt Accountant & Writer on the 12 th March 1867. He works well under close supervision - His conduct has been good during the past 12 months. (Signed) W. F. Donaghue Supervisor, D.P.M. Kullimodu 28 th March 1868 }		28 th Feb 1867	On the return of permanent incumbent and on promotion	
		1 st May 1868	Trans- ferred to 4 th Range bar Range	
		17 th July 68	Promo- tion	
		30 th Nov 1868	Dismis- sion	
		1 st Aprl 1871	Survey dispensed with	
		31 st March 1872	Promotion	
		31 st July 1874	Supply of Roads given on contract by Colonel Roberts	
		8 th March 1876	On the return of permanent incumbent	

No. 1841

338
District Engineer Office
Camp Negapatam 29 October 1877.

From

Captain R.R.E. Brockman Esq
District Engineer Tanjore

To

Colonel E. A. Ford Esq
Chief Engineer D.A.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your endorsement No. 2542 dated 11 October 1877 calling upon me for a report on a petition presented to Government by one J. Nungasamy Dillay Lake Sub Overseer in this District protesting against his dismissal from the Department as an act of injustice on my part.

Quintall Oakes on the eve of his departure for England in June 1876 requested me, if I could see my way to do so, to
give

give Nurgasany Pillay a further trial in the Department from which, as will be seen from his Service Register, he was on one occasion compelled to resign, and on another, summarily dismissed. He represented him to me as a man honest in the main more by reason of his eccentricity amounting at times to madness, than by reason of any inherent good quality. I appointed him therefore, as he states, to act in the place of one Nana Now who was dismissed, and sent him to serve in the Regapatam Range. Almost from the commencement of his Service there under Lieut Norilly his eccentricity, obstinacy, self-opiniativeness, and inclination to argue instead of obey, became manifest, and the Range Officer found that instead of the

Overseers

35
Overseers being an assistance to him in looking after work, he required more particularly: himself to be looked after. I did not wish to deal hardly with the man and took the opportunity therefore of reducing him to the grade of Sub Overseer 7th grade in equal salary, as I felt convinced that he could never rise above the grade of 3rd class Palmy Overseer, nor even be a credit to the Department in that grade. His conduct in this position was no better than it always had been. He showed himself indifferent to orders and unable to carry out what was required of him. Not a month passed in which he had not to be found fault with, and things culminated in the report No 154 dated 20 June last from Lieut Norilly regarding this man's vagaries and gross neglect of duty.

This report I sent to Rungasamy Pillay for such explanation as he wished to offer. The result was his letter No. 75 dated 27 June forwarded with the Range Officer's marginal remarks. I then determined to transfer him to the Puttucottah Taluk, as a locality where he could do but little damage. My order to this effect is dated 2 July 1877 No. 1121. In the meantime the Range Officer who had inspected the Vedarnien Canal clearance, which was under the direct orders of Rungasamy Pillay, found that his orders had been so utterly disregarded in the execution of the work that he was forced to report Rungasamy's conduct to me in his letter No. 198 dated 13 July. Upon receiving this I felt that his retention for any longer period in this

Department

Department would be imposing an undue burden on the shoulders of any Range Officers under whom he would be placed, and who as it was had quite enough to occupy their time and attention in ordinary times. I therefore dismissed him in my order No. 1205 dated 19 July. Rungasamy Pillay's protest dated 25 July was forwarded by me to the Range Officer for his remarks, and these are embodied in his letter No. 230 dated 31 July picturing the Overseer's petition. The above are all the facts connected with the petitioner's case, and I can only say that, in acting as I have done, I have been actuated solely by the desire to maintain the credit and ensure the harmonious working of this Department. It will be observed from the petitioner's Appeal to Government that

that he has not hesitated in ascribing sinister motives to all with whom he was brought in contact, from the Valuing Overseer directly over him to the District Engineer, and he has so far forgot himself as to accuse the Navy Officer of tampering with a public record in his Service Register. This accusation which amounts to nothing less than a libel, is refuted by the appearance of that document itself, wherein the only entry made by Lieutenant Romilly has been the usual Certificate as to the petitioner's character and conduct.

Lieutenant Romilly states, and I have every reason for accepting the truth of his statement, that he has no recollection whatever of having used words of the nature which petitioner

has

has ascribed to him.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant

Edmund Curran Captain R.

District Engineer

Copy

Subt. of 1877 *India*.
PUBLIC WORKS.

To

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., 5 Nov. 1877, No. 1467 W

Nos. 56-57

Rungaswamy Pillay
Late Sub-Mercer, Tanjore
Dr. Declines to interfere
on behalf of —

Intro. Rep.
10.11.77.