outside the 3rd Circle.

B.

18/7/81

B.N. 1835 ½ 26. July 1881

L.R. III Circle

Eq. Brue.

Resd
26-7-81

O.L.S. 10/7. Rec. 19.7.81.

Ord to disburse
Charges Bills
Contractors &c

Issue circular
to all S.E. re-
questing them to
see that the
provisions of
para 1207 of
Code are strictly
attended to &
that in no case
should contracts be
observed to send
cheques to Con-
tractors as in fact
none ought to
pass to disbursers
— also request that
Divl Engrs Clerks
or Accounts for in
whose absence Contracts
to sign Contracts for

The Hon'ble the Financial

For orders

The accompanying case has arisen out of charges preferred by the Head Clerk and Accountant of the Executive Engineer's Office Tirhut Circle by Dr. against the Head Clerk of the Executive Engineer's Office on the ground that the latter requested the Accountant to keep a blank mark of 3 per cent against payments made to Contractors vouchers/payments in the Division Office and to hand the same to him on pain of his incurring his displeasure, and worse from his Division &c.

It is impossible to condone this case in which a number of natives combined with absolute but unsubstantiated evidence, framing allegations against a public servant impossible as I humbly submit to record —

the story may in its main features be true - but the Head Clerk in the Supt. Engineers Office may have made an attempt as stated to levy the blackmail but if this be the case some of the evidence is to my mind quite incredible

The Plaintiffs admit that the communications were in all cases made only to the one individual addressed and the only number of persons to whom the matter was known as it was exercised extortion towards the unfortunate object of the tale - No astute man bent on plunder of this kind would have shewn his hand in this way and if he had done so there would have been other collateral proofs, as I cannot but think

The one fact that has an ugly look is that the Head Clerk (Paraskevaidis Naidu) did apparently intend himself in trying to get a contract for another individual, but even as regards this, as pointed out by Col. Bailey he did not proceed in the effectual way that would have made Subpatel itself to an active and anxious rogue

On the whole it has seemed to me that the probabilities inclined to the view taken by the Supt. Engineer, and as will be observed this is the view I have taken of the matter in my memo No 116 of the 30th May 1881 confirming generally his decision but directing attention to certain points which have since been answered by the Supt. Engineer in his No 39 C of the 4th July 1881

These late points do not materially affect the case and I shall deal with them merely departmentally but the letter of the

question as arising upon the present decision is that relating to the punishment of the Accountant Muttuswamy Naidu who the Lieut. Governor in the first place sentenced to dismissal and subsequently on the remonstrance of the Examiner directed to be reduced & transferred

The Examiner in his No 33 W of the 7th May submitted the case to the "information and orders of Government"

Though evidently not concurring with Colonel Beatty in his finding as against the Accountant the Examiner has suggested that the mild sentence of reduction from Rs 70 to 60 per mensem & transfer be carried out at the same time stating that he will be glad if a "less severe punishment" be carried out

For the general reasons I have given above, and in my memo of the 30th May the Accountant practically stands in the light of confessing with the Head Clerk of the Examiners Office to some of the charges against the Accused, and although as I have said the case is one in regard to which it is difficult to satisfy oneself as to the truth I think he must accept the position, and be made to suffer accordingly.

It is also clear to me that the former two individuals also have been misled as in the matter are separated the latter

Owing to the doubts which I have entertained I would not have found fault the punishment to any great length, and would therefore if the Government assent direct that the Accountant be reduced to Rs 40 for mensem for 3 months, and be transferred to another

an insufficient authority

division in another
circle

All the others must
have already or will
be swiftly dealt with
departmentally

Mr C Norton has evidently
deemed his Accountant to
pay our Charges to Con-
-tractors which is referred
to rules as holding out
Compensations to Such men
to buy blank mail

These and other irregular-
-ities will become to stop
by Such orders as I can issue
and trust be called to as
further remark arise

AHH

14.7.81

Revised Decision in the matter of the charge brought by the Head Clerk Cundaswami Pillay and Head Account=ant Muthuswami Naidu of the Tri=chinopoly Division against Paran=coosum Naidu Head Clerk Superin=tending Engineer's Office.

To meet the wishes of the Ex=miner, and taking into consideration the strong feeling displayed by Mr. Nor for against Paran coosum Naidu which probably misled and tempted his subordinates, the Supg. Engineer has decided to modify and moderate the sentence he pronounced on the persons engaged in the recent false charge against Paran coosum Naidu.

Vide demi Official dated 4th May 1887.

Cundaswami Pillay lately Head Clerk Trichinopoly Division will be reduced from a pay of Rs 60 in Trichinopoly to Rs 40, as Second Clerk in South Arcot Division Office.

Arunachellam Pillay Sub Overseer 3d. Grade will be suspended

for one month and transferred to the Musiri Sub Division; a Sub Overseer of the 3d. Grade being transferred from Musiri to Pichinopoly to take his place.

Muthuswami Naidu will be transferred to the Examiner's Office on a reduced pay of Rs 40, but will do duty in the Pichinopoly Division Office until he is relieved.

The Orignal decision will hold good as regards Contractor Lya-=swami Pillay.

J. Beatty. Lt. Col. R.E.
Supt. Engineer 3d Circle

Kodaikanal
12th May 1881.

the honour to forward a Revised Decision and to request you will be good enough to send an account-ant to relieve Muthuswamie Naidu at your earliest convenience.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obdt. Servt.

R. Beatty. Lt. Col. R.E.
Supy. Engineer 3rd Circle

4/5/15

Dec 19/5

FROM THE EXAMINER P.W.ACCOUNTS,

MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MADRAS, 19th MAY 1881.

NO. 43 W

SIR,

IN CONTINUATION OF MY NO. 33 W DATED 7TH. MAY 1881, I HAVE THE HONOR TO SUBMIT, IN ORIGINAL, REVISED DECISION OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, 3RD. CIRCLE, IN THE MATTER OF THE TRICHINOPOLY ACCOUNTANT'S CASE, RECEIVED WITH SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S NO. 227 T.C. OF 17TH. INSTANT.

2. THE DEMI-OFFICIAL REFERRED TO IN THE MARGIN OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S DECISION, WAS ONE IN WHICH I PROPOSED THE TRANSFER AND REDUCTION OF THE ACCOUNTANT INSTEAD OF HIS DISMISSAL, SO STRONGLY URGED BY THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER. THE 'SENTENCE' NOW PRONOUNCED IS, NO DOUBT, INTENDED AS A RECOMMENDATION, FOR SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER HAS NO AUTHORITY TO ORDER THE TRANSFER, WHICH LIES WITH GOVERNMENT ON MY RECOMMENDATION.

3. I WOULD REQUEST THE RETURN OF THIS ORIGINAL DOCUMENT WITH THE OTHER ORIGINALS PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED FOR THE ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

I.

† Not rec'd at Govt 20/5

I HAVE THE HONOR TO BE ,

SIR,

YOUR MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT.

D. C. Kumaon

EXAMINER P.W.ACCOUNTS.

PWCns. 3282.

FROM THE EXAMINER P.W.ACCOUNTS,

MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

P.W.DEPARTMENT.

NO. 43W

DATED 19 MAY 1881.

RECD.

ENCLOSURE 2.

Submd. in Secrett Regr.

FORWARDS COPY OF LETTER FROM THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER 3RD.CIRCLE REGARDING REVISED DECISION IN CASE OF ACCOUNTANT MOOTHOO SAWMY NAIDU.

P.D. 32/5

FROM THE EXAMINER P.W.ACCOUNTS,

MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

NO. 33W MADRAS, 7th MAY 1881.

SIR,

I HAVE THE HONOR TO SUBMIT FOR THE INFORMATION OF GOVERNMENT THE ACCOMPANYING FILE OF ORIGINAL PAPERS RECEIVED UNDER COVER OF LETTER NO. 152 T.C. OF 2ND. INSTANT, FROM THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, 3RD. CIRCLE, TOGETHER WITH A MEMO THEREON, IN WHICH MY VIEWS OF THE CASE ARE EXPRESSED.

2. I BEG TO BE FURNISHED WITH THE ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT REGARDING MY PROPOSAL TO REDUCE AND TRANSFER THE ACCOUNTANT OF THE TRICHINOPOLY DIVISION. THE MAN IS AT PRESENT DRAWING RS. 70 PER MENSEM AND THE REDUCTION WOULD BRING HIM TO RS. 40; SHOULD GOVERNMENT BE PLEASED TO TAKE A MORE LENIENT VIEW OF THE CASE, I SHALL BE ONLY TOO GLAD THAT A LESS SEVERE PUNISHMENT SHOULD RESULT.

3. EARLY ORDERS ARE SOLICITED; AS ALSO THE RETURN OF THE ORIGINAL PAPERS NOW SUBMITTED.

I HAVE THE HONOR TO BE,
SIR,
YOUR MOST OBEDIENT SERVANT.

W 3/5

D. L. Cannon

EXAMINER P. W. ACCOUNTS.

P. W. C. No 3025

FROM THE EXAMINER P.W. ACCOUNTS,

MADRAS.

TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,

P.W. DEPARTMENT.

NO. 33 W

DATED 7th MAY 1881.

RECD. 19th —"—

ENCLOSURES.

SUBMITS THE CASE OF THE ACCOUNTANT TRICHINOPOLY DIVISION FOR THE ORDERS OF GOVERNMENT.

Entd. in Receipt Regr.

O.S. 3425

R.F.

3

From orders

No. 1835 W PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 26th July 1881.

Read the following :—

From the Examiner, P.W. accounts } (No. 33 W dated 7th May 81)

" Do do - (" 43 W " 19th do -)

" The Supt. Engineer III Circle } (" No. 380 " 4th July 81)

The papers read above report charges against the Head Clerk of the office of the Supty: Engineer 3rd Circle brought forward by the Head Clerk of the Executive Engineer's Office, Trichinopoly Division, and the Divisional Accountant, Muthuswamy Naidu.

The case as affecting the two Head Clerks has already been considered and disposed of by the Exptg: Engineer and the Chief Engineer and the Accountant Genl: = thereanny Raidu now remains to be dealt with.

After a review of all the correspon: = dence, the Honorable the Governor in Council considers that the conduct of the Accountant in preparing grave charges against another subordinate which he has failed to substantiate has been reprehensible. As a punishment for the ~~discreditable~~ part which he has taken in the proceedings, Muthuswamy Raidu will be reduced from ₹70 to ₹40 per mensem = tem for 3 months; and he transferred, under the orders of the Examiners, to another Division.

O.S. 32/5

outside the 3rd Circle.

B.N. 1835 & 26. July 1881

O.L. 10/7. 14.7.81. 25/7/81

O.S. 32/5

O.S. 32/5

C.E. III Circle

Ref: Bhola

Recd
26-7-81

P.W.C. No 3943

From,
The Supg Engineer
3d Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 38 C

Dated 4th July 1881
Rec'd 8 — w —

Encls - 11

Payments to Con=
=tractors in Lucknow=
=paly Division -

Reports the result
of enquiries as to how
---- were made by
the late Offg Executive
Engineer -

Entd. in Receipt
Regr.

14.7.81

14.7.81 25/7/81
6.8.7.81 O.L. 10/7.

outside the 3rd Circle.

B.N.

13/7/81

B.N. 1835 2/3 26. July 1881

E.E. III Circle.

Exp. Bror.

Desd
26-7-81

O.S. 10/7. m. 19.7.81. R. 25/7/81

O.S. 12/5

O.S. 32/5

P. W. C. No 3943

From,
The Supg Engineer
3d Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 38 C

Dated 4th July 1881
Rcd. 8—w

Encls-11

Payments to Con-
=tractors in Execu=
=tive Division.

Reports the result
of enquiries as to how
----- were made by
the late Offg Executive
Engineer.

Entd. in Receipt
Regr.

m. 19.7.81
w. 8.7.81

R. 25/7/81

O.S. 10/7.

He now explains that the meaning he intended to convey was that "as he had not been in the habit of collecting money from Contractors, he did not understand how it was to be done".

8. I have called the attention of all Divisional officers to the orders prohibiting the payment of Contractors or Suppliers by imprest holders or any Subordinate; and that the term subordinate includes Clerks and accountants. I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obdt. Servt.

C. Beatty - Lt Col. RE

Supg Engineer 3d Circle

5. I enquired of Mr. Norfor whether he had any Statement he desired to make, and I send his reply. — From this it would appear that he was not aware of the Orders of Government that Cheques were not to be "conveyed" to Contractors "directly or indirectly through the medium of Subordinates". He seems also to have imagined that part of the duty of a Cashier, if one were appointed to his Division, would be to relieve him of the duty of handing over Cheques direct to the Contractors.

6. It seems to me certain that while Mr. Norfor was in charge of the Pechiwopoly Division a large proportion of the Cheques to Contractors were delivered to them through the Accountant.

7. With regard to the Accountants' Statement that,

"He did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the Contractors".

the effect that while Mr. Manson was in charge of the Division, the Cheques were delivered to the Contractors by that Officer personally; but that subsequently, except on two occasions, they received the Cheques from the Accountant.

The depositions of the other Contractors taken several days later and at or near head quarters, are not so reliable, as being open to the suspicion that the Contractors had been advised what they should say.

3. It seems to have been usual with the Contractors to come to Ipiscopoly to be paid. They would sometimes deliver their Bills to Mr. Norfor, but it seems to have been more the custom to deliver the Bills to the Accountant, who would check it, obtain a cheque from the Divisional Officer and deliver it to the Contractor. Some of the Contractors however state they received Cheques direct from Mr. Norfor, took them to the Accountant, and then received them back; if this were really the case the Contractors were put to a good deal of unnecessary trouble.

4. The accountant was called on for his explanation as to how it happened that Cheques were sometimes handed over to Contractors by him. He states that "when Contractors were present they got the cheques direct from the Divisional officer; at other times from him. But as the Contractors came to Ipsichinopoly to deliver their Bills, and receive payment, they would always be present to receive their cheques; unless the Divisional Officer happened to be absent, in which case they would no doubt deliver the bills to the Accountant, and receive their cheque from him on their next visit

There was clearly no necessity for the cheque passing through the Accountant's hands at all, as the Counterfoil was with the Divisional Officer, and it would give the name, date and amount.

2709

5. I enquired of Mr. Norfor whether he had any Statement he desired to make, and I send his reply. — Upon this it would appear that he was not aware of the Orders of Government that Cheques were not to be "conveyed" to Contractors "directly or indirectly through the medium of Subordinates". He seems also to have imagined that part of the duty of a Cashier, if one were appointed to his Division, would be to relieve him of the duty of handing over Cheques direct to the Contractors.

6. It seems to me certain that while Mr. Norfor was in charge of the Liechinopoly Division a large proportion of the Cheques to Contractors ~~were~~ delivered to them through the Accountant.

7. With regard to the Accountants Statement that,

"He did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the Contractors".

O.S. 32/5

P. N. 3943/19

7

2709
13.6.19.

Imm.

C.H.T. Norfor Esq.
Asst Engineer
Liechinopoly
Explanations
re
The Cashiership
3rd Circle
Thro' Engineer
Representation.

Dated 11th
Recd 13 June/19
No 8

Approving Explanation regarding certain points raised by the Chief Engr relative to the Introduction of Accountant Pelagius by the Accountant Mr Emburey & directing Mr Norfor to be informed accordingly.

No 2662

Forwarded,
Asst
12.6.19.
Secy Cons.

as it was discretional with the Sn: Engineer
to make the arrangement under para
1257 of the P. W. Code; Govt not having
appointed a Cashier.

3. I informed you the same later on,
and requested you to obtain the
sanction of Government, to the appoint
-ment of a Cashier, for the Sheikhy
Division, as I considered that my
Accountant had quite enough to do
without writing up the Cash Book.

4. I do not know what action, if any,
you have taken on my letter.

5. I considered that whoever kept
the Cash Book should disburse
money. the Accountant has kept
it for years past.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obt Servant

C. Alston
Assistant Engineer

Encl. 34

P.W. 3943/1

From The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Divn

To The Supdg Engineer
Third Circle

No. 999

Dated 20th
Deopd. 20th
Recd 21st
Jan 1881

Ex: 9

Disbursement of
Cheques to Contractors —
Submits enquiries made
regarding — thereto &c &c.

P.W. 3943/1

2709
13.6.80.

From.

C.H.T. Napier Esq.
Acting Superintendent
Negapatam

To The Acting Superintendent
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly
Respondent.

Dated 11th
Rec'd 13th June/80
No 8

Approving Establishment
appended to certain items
mentioned by the Chief Engr
relative to the Antiquities
of the Department placed
by the accountant at the
disposal of the Executive Engr

No 2662

Forwarded
Acting
N.C.N.
Exe Engr

U.S. 32/5

No 999

Trichinopoly Division Office
Trichinopoly 20th June 1881

From

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

Sir,

With reference to your No 3087C of the 2 Instant directing me to make enquiries regarding the Cheques that have been handed over to Contractor thro' the Accountant of this Office I have the honor to inform you that I have examined 8 Contractors and submit a summary of their replies:

Enclosures 9
8. Depositions of Contractors
1- Explanation of Accty.
9

(1) Contractor Ramasami Naidu was examined by me on the 2 Instant as the Deposition and his deposition is to the effect that he received Cheques directly from the Office during Mr Masson's charge and subsequently thro' the Accountant after signing the bills with him and he did not

P. N. 3943/1

2709
13.6.81.

Sir.

C.H.T. Master Esq.
Executive Engineer
Negapatam

To The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Thro' The Superintending Engineer
Trichinopoly.

Dated 11th June/81
Rec'd 13th June/81
No 8

Approving Establishment regarding certain bonds received by the Chief Bookkeeper & the Assistant Bookkeeper & the Assistant Bookkeeper by the Accountant of the Executive Engineer's Division.

No 2662

Forwarded

A.C.

P. N.
Cuddalore

at any time receive from the Head Clerk Cundasamy Pillay. I find from the Accounts that this man in Mr Norfor's time received 6 Cheques amounting to Rs 763.

(2) Contractor Ramies was examined the same date at the same place also & he deposed that except on one occasion in February last he received all his Cheques thro' the Accountant & he did not receive at any time from Head Clerk Cundasamy Pillay. I find from the accounts that this man in Mr Norfor time received 8 Cheques amounting to Rs 1196

(3) Contractor Runganada Chetty was also examined on the same date at the Kesperamint. He stated that he only once received Cheque direct from Mr Norfor at Kuldalai & except on this occasion he received always thro' the Head Accounts and did not receive at any time from Head Clerk Cundasamy Pillay. I find from the accounts that this man in Mr Norfors time received 7 Cheques amounting to Rs 2450.

(4) Contractor Ramasamy Pillay was examined by me at Office on the 10th. His statement is that he received Cheques both from the Accountant & Mr Norfor and the greater extent was direct from the Officer and since he received from the Head Clerk. I find from the accounts that this man in Mr Norfor's time received 17 Cheques amounting to Rs 1254.

(5) Contractor Mannedasayagam Pillay was examined at Office on the 13th. He stated he received Cheques both from the Accountant & Mr Norfor and the extent of transactions has been equal. Did not at all receive from the Head Clerk I find from the Accounts that this man in Mr Norfor's time received 9 Cheques amounting to Rs 2612.

(6) Contractor Baboo Daib was examined also at Office on the 13th. He deposed he received Cheques direct always from the Officer but delivered them to the Accountant for entry & got them back from the Acct & never received from the Head Clerk. I

I find from the Account that this man
in Mr Rosfors time received 6 Cheques
amounting to Rs 1316.

(7) Contractor Annasamy Iyer who was
also examined at Office on the 13th de-
-posed to the same effect as Baboo Saib.
I find from the Account that this man
in Mr Rosfors time received 5 Cheques
amounting to Rs 663.

(8) Contractor Ramier was examined by
me at Srirangam on the 16th & his de
-position is also the same as that
given by the 6th and 7th Contractors.
I find from the Account that this man
in Mr Rosfors time received 12 Cheques
amounting to Rs 5522.

II The written depositions of
these Contractors are herewith submitted.
Of these 8 men, 3 deposed to having received
the Cheques almost invariably from the Accountant,
2 partly from the Officer & partly from the Accountant
and the 3 remaining always directly from the
Officer but gave them to the Accountant for
safety and redelivery.

III The Accountant's written explana-
-tion is also herewith sent as directed.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
A Subramania
Offg Sr. Engineer & C. Division

Pr 3943/81
2

From The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Divn

To The Supdg Engineer
Third Circle

No. 999

Dated 20.
Despd. 20. } Inwd 181
Recd 21st

En: 9

Disbursement of
Cheques to Contractors—
Submits enquiries made
regarding — thereto &c &c.

Pr 3943/81
3

Trichinopoly 15 June 1881.

To

The Executive Engineer

Trichinopoly Dt.

Sir

With reference to your Endorsement on Asst Engineer's Memo= =randum No 308 JC dy 2 June 1881. asking me for explanation of the points raised by the Chief Engineer in paras 5 to 9 of his Memorandum No 1168 dy 30th May 1881. I beg to offer my explanations as the queries as follow

1st Query. "Explain the expression" "he did not understand in what way he was to make Collections from the Contractors"

The above words were a verbal given by me to a question put at the enquiry held by the Asst Engr as to how Collections are to be made from Contractors for Paramboke and otherwise, by stating the above the meaning I intended to convey was that as I had not been in the habit of collecting money from

Mr 3943/81
4

S/
15/6/81

Trichinopoly 15 June 1881.

To

The Executive Engineer

Trichinopoly Dt.

Sir

With reference to your Endorsement on Supdg Engineer's Memo= =randum No 308 TC dy 2 June 1881. asking me for explanation of the points raised by the Chief Engineer in paras 5 to 9 of his Memorandum No 1167 dy 30th May 1881 I beg to offer my explanations as your queries as follow

1st Query. "Explain the expressions" "he did not understand in what way he was to make Collections from the Contractors"

The above words were a verbal given by me to a question put at the enquiry held by the Supdg Engr as to how Collections are to be made from Contractors for Paramaratum Naidu, by stating the above the meaning I intended to convey was that as I had not been in the habit of Collecting money from

Deponent given by Contractor Ramaswamy Naidu regarding the practice with him to obtain his cheques or Bills subscribed by them.

Mr. Mansergh's own Clerk Govinda Row would take his cheque Books & Bills for signature & after obtaining the signature of Mr. Horsfall's own Clerk Govinda Row would bring the Bills & cheques to me for signature & after obtaining my signature on the cheques & Bills Govinda Row would take away the cheques & Bills for signature of Mr. Horsfall & Govinda Row would bring the cheques & Bills to me for signature.

I used to receive cheques direct from Mr. Mansergh while he was in charge; & when Mr. Horsfall was in charge I used to receive cheques from the Accountant after signing the bills with the Accountant. I did not receive at any time from Mr. Horsfall at his Bungalow. I did not receive at any time from Clerk Govinda any bills.

A Subbrayalu
2/6/81.
Camp Appellant

Deposition given by Contractor Ramsden regarding the practice with him to obtain his cheques or bills submitted by him.

I used to deliver bill to Mr Horsfall who used to take the Office for checking. No sooner had the bill been checked than I used to sign with a receive cheque from the Accountant. I do not, in my experience, recollect to have received at any time from Mr Horsfall at his Bungalow. I did not receive at any time from Lokesh Chandra any billag. It was customary to deliver the bills also to the Accountant.

Since stating the above what crossed my memory is that I received only once (February) a cheque direct from the gentleman & delivered the same to the Accountant; and now my appearing signature to the bill I put it has been given to me.

Subjedar.
2/6/87. Camp Upper Anicut

Mr 3943/87
10

Deposition given by Contractor Ponnuswamy Chettiar regarding the practice with him to obtain his cheques or Bills submitted by him.

I used to deliver bill to the Accountant in the Office, who, on checking it, used to obtain the cheque from the Officer & deliver it to me after getting the bill signed by me. I did not receive cheque direct from the Officer in the Gentleman's House. I had only once received cheque direct from the Officer at Coolitalay. I did not receive at any time from Clerk Cumdasamy Pillay.

C. Ponnuswamy Chettiy

A. Subrayachari
2/6/87.

Mr 3943/87
10

Deposition given by Contractor Rungaswamy Chettiar regarding the practice with him to obtain his cheques on Bills submitted by him.

I used to deliver bill to the Accountants in the Office, who, on checking it, used to obtain the cheque from the Officer & deliver it to me after getting the bill signed by me. I did not receive cheque direct from the Officer in the Gentlemen's House. I had only once received cheque direct from the Officer at Coatitalay. I did not receive at any time from Velarkurichi Cumdasamy Pillay.

A. Ramanatha Chetty

A. Subramaniam
2/6/87.

Deposition by Contractor Ramaswamy Pillay with reference to obtaining his cheques.

I used to deliver bills to the Accountant in the Office; he used to check the same & to obtain the cheque & deliver it to me. When Mr. Thorpe was in the Head Quarter it was also customary to receive direct as well from him as from the Accountant in the Office. Greater part of receiving my cheques was direct from the gentleman. I did not receive direct from Velath Sundarasamy Pillay.

Ramaswamy Pillai
Contractor

A Schedule
10/6/82.

1881

PW 3943/15

Deponent by Contract Manukaragam pilly with reference to his practice in obtaining cheques:-

[illegible] Bills on Govt

[illegible] Cheque

[illegible] Cheque

[illegible] - Govt

Accountant General

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Head Clerk [illegible]

[illegible]

I had received cheque direct from Mr. Horsford on presenting bill, & so thro' the Accountant also in the Office. The receipt of cheque direct from the gentleman, & thro' the Accountant will be equal in extent. It is not customary to receive cheque from Headclerk Cundasamy pillay.

[illegible]

13/6/81.

Deposition by Contractor Kabbo Sahib in this practice in obtaining cheques.

I used to deliver bill to the Asstt. & now his giving it to me after checking. I used to deliver it to the gentleman, & receive cheque direct from him afterwards; the cheque is presented to the Accountant: and on getting it entered by him I used to receive it back from him - I always received cheques only from the gentleman - I did not receive from the Clerk Cundasamy Pillay.

A Subbachari

Deposition by Contractor Kabirsahib on his practice in obtaining cheques.

I used to deliver bill to the Accountant. I saw him giving it to me after checking. I used to deliver it to the gentleman, & receive cheque direct from him afterwards; the cheque is presented to the Accountant; and on getting it entered by him I used to receive it back from him - I always received cheques only from the gentleman - I did not receive from the clerk Cundasamy Pillay.

Kabirsahib

Taken before me at Coimbatore 21-5-81.

Deposition by Contractor Ramgiri with reference to practice in obtaining his cheques:-

I used to deliver bill to the Accountant, & on his checking the same I used to present it to obtain cheque direct from the gentleman; afterwards I used to take & show the cheque to the Accountant; and, after it entry in his books, I used to get it back. Sometimes the Acctt used to send for the cheque & deliver it to me. The number of cheques I received direct from the gentleman used to be much more than I got thro' the Acctt. I used not to receive cheques from the Acctt

14/6/87.

Cuddapah
Pillay

Coly 21-8-87.

Establishment

P.W.D. No. 3050

From,
The Supg Engineer
3d Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 211 E.C.

Dated 16th May 1881

Rec'd 20 inst.

Encls. 60.

Mems: No. 116 of 30th May/81

Forwarding Appeal
from Mr. Norfor —
against a decision
of the Supg Engineer.

Entered in Coly 21-5-81.

Br 3943/81
4

Wr 3943/87
4

Wr Dept

Memorandum No 116 of 30th May 1881

Letter from the Supg Engineer 3rd Circle No 211 J. Cal
16th May 1881.

Petition from K. Candusamy pillay, Head Clerk,
Executive Engineer's Office, Cuddapah, dated 18th May 81.

The Chief Engineer must decline to interfere with the decision of the Supg Engineer in this case.

2. Accusations preferred with altogether insufficient proof must necessary be viewed with suspicion, and the Consequences of such injudicious action must be accepted.

3. Mr Norfor has, in the opinion of the Chief Engineer, displayed marked want of judgment in giving support and Countenance to proceedings of this character. and has further violated the Confidence due to the Superintending Engineers [illegible] specially called for, the

18/30 Dept

4. There are other features in the case which, under ordinary circumstances, would call for severe animadversion, but seeing that Mr. Norfor's conduct in connection with another matter has quite recently come under the unfavorable notice of Government, and has led to his removal from his Division, the Chief Engineer is unwilling to add more on the present occasion than to express the hope that Mr. Norfor will profit by the lessons he has already received, and will act with greater discretion in future.

5. There is, however, one point regarding which further information is required. In para 33 of the Supy. Engineer's Proceedings of 28th April 1881, Muthusamy Naidu is represented to have stated that "he did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the Contractors; the Contractors some times receive cheques from him, sometimes from the Division

18th May 1881

To,

unintelligible, and the man should be called on to explain his meaning.

7. If, as he says, cheques passed through his hands, does he wish it to be believed that he did not know how to levy blackmail? The Chief Engineer can understand the man advancing the plea that although money thus passed through his hands, he valued his character too highly to extort contributions. But the words taken as they stand are, if properly reported, audacious in their effrontery.

8. The reply suggests the further enquiry as to the circumstances under which this man has, contrary to the express order of Government, been placed in a position involving the disbursement of funds, and to what extent the irregularity has been allowed.

9. Mr. Norfor must be aware that, not only is such an arrangement contrary to the rules of the Department, but that if this man [illegible] temptation, he is

18/5/81 Norfor

4. There are other features in the case which, under ordinary circumstances, would call for severe animadversion, but seeing that Mr. Norfor's conduct in connection with another matter has quite recently come under the unfavorable notice of Government, and has led to his removal from his Division, the Chief Engineer is unwilling to add more on the present occasion than to express the hope that Mr. Norfor will profit by the lessons he has already received, and will act with greater discretion in future.

5. There is, however, one point regarding which further information is required. In para 33 of the Supy. Engineer's Proceedings of 28th April 1881, Muthusamy Naidu is represented to have stated that "he did not understand in what "way he was to make Collections from the "Contractors; the Contractors receive cheques "sometimes from him, sometimes from the Division "

unintelligible, and the man should be called on to explain his meaning.

7. If, as he says, cheques passed through his hands, does he wish it to be believed that he did not know how to levy black mail? The Chief Engineer can understand the man advancing the plea that although money thus passed through his hands, he valued his character too highly to extort contributions. But the words taken as they stand are, if properly reported, an audacious piece of effrontery.

8. The reply suggests the further enquiry as to the circumstances under which this man has, contrary to the express order of Government, been placed in a position involving the disbursement of funds, and to what extent the irregularity has been allowed.

9. Mr. Norfor must be aware that, not only is such an arrangement contrary to the rules of the Department, but that if this man [illegible] temptation, he is

himself much to blame. Before dealing further on this point, however, the Chief Engineer must request the Supg. Engineer to investigate it fully & report thereon.

10. In conclusion the Chief Engineer must observe that there is evidence throughout these proceedings that writers in offices interest themselves in the matter of obtaining contracts for Public Works, and advocating individual claims. The practice is open to the gravest abuse, and the Chief Engineer must therefore look to the Supg. Engineer to discountenance it by all the weight of his authority.

(Sd.) R. A. Sankey, Col R.E.
Chief Engineer, N.W. Dept.

Memo No. 116
of 30th May

Enclosures
1. Copy of Testimonials
1. Copy of depositions

18th May 1881

To,
The Chief Engineer
N.W.D.
Roorkee

The humble appeal of Lt. Lundsaamy Pillay Head Clerk Executive Engineer Office, Sirhind Poly Division.

Most Respected Sir,

With due respect and profound submission I beg most respectfully to submit for your honor's kind consideration, this my humble appeal against my unjust dismissal from the Department.

In submitting the same I am perfectly aware that I am appealing against the decision passed by the Chief Engineer, but I nevertheless relying on the justice of the same I venture to make this appeal.

I have been 11 years employed in the Deptt. bearing an unblemished reputation throughout, as the several testimonials (copies enclosed) given to me will amply testify.

I have been dismissed on the charge of having made a false complaint against the Head Clerk of the Supt. Engrs. office in having stated that he had asked me to allow for him a commission of 3 per cent on all payments made to Contractors & which the Supt. Engineer after an inconclusive enquiry decleried that such did not take place & that I was actuated solely by malicious motives.

18th November 1872.

Executive Engr.

(Illegible) R.S.
Cash.

To, The Supt

I beg most solemnly to declare that such is not the fact, in as much as we have been most particular friends & I had no personal motive to bring such a charge against him.

Parameswaram Naidu Head Clerk Duty Engrs Office having urged me to collect for him 3 per cent on all payments made to Contractors I deemed it to be my duty to bring the matter to the notice of the Executive Engineer (my immediate superior) & I accordingly did early in December last. Again the subject was urged upon me by Sub Overseer Arumachellam Pillay & Contractor Lyrasawmy Pillay (vide Copies of their depositions enclosed) of which I took no notice as the subject had been brought before my immediate superior with severe warnings & threats having since been received from the Duty Engrs Office I was compelled to solicit the Executive Engineer by writing to convey the fact to the notice of the Duty Engineer as I thought the animadversions of the Duty Engineer under the misrepresentation of his Head Clerk had not been justified. The Executive Engineer having enquired into the matter submitted my petition to the Duty Engineer with his letter No 4192 dated 17th March /81.

It will be perceived that the Duty Engineer has not called upon his Head Clerk to explain the charges brought against him, but on the other hand, it is palpable that with his

[illegible]

view of superseding his Head Clerk the cause which may be attributed.

I beg to offer my defence on each point of the Duty Engineer's decision.

In para 4 of the General remarks of the Duty Engineer he states that the evidence of witnesses to prove the charge against the Head Clerk of the Duty Engineer office is perfectly worthless & such as would not be accepted in any Court of Law & in Paras 20 & 25 of the Proceedings the Duty Engineer declares his conviction that the evidence is perfectly worthless not being in any way substantiated.

I humbly beg to state that no one would dare speak matters of this kind in the presence of a third person & that Head Clerk Parameswaram Naidu had not in any manner disproved the statement given by the witnesses in support of the charge.

With regard to the latter part of para 6 of the Duty Engineers general remarks I beg to submit that on the day of enquiry I was duly asked to state "how Parameswaram Naidu expected me to collect for him the percentage" my reply to this was as that contained in para 41 of the Proceedings, that is "I dare not know how Parameswaram Naidu expected me to collect money".

In respect of para 8 of the Duty Engineers general remarks I beg to submit that not being placed under the direct order of the Duty Engineer he consequently can know little of

18th November /72.

Executive Engr

Copies of Testimonials

K. Cundasawmy Pillay has been a volunteer in this office for 10 months and for some weeks as acting Copyist. He writes a very fair hand and seems to be a deserving youth.

/Signed/ H. L. Prendergast
Capt^n R.E.
Offg Supt Trig 8^a Div^n

8^th April 1870.

K. Cundasawmy Pillay has been employed as a volunteer & Copyist in the Trig Engineers office 8^a Division from March 1869. He is now acting 2^nd Copyist. He has performed his duties satisfactorily.

/Signed/ G. W. Payne
Sergt
W. S. C.
Offg Supt Trig 8^a Div
the Acting Assistant

28^th February 1871.

K. Cundasawmy Pillay accountant & writer of the Dindigul Range office is a first class penman has been very industrious - one since he has been in the Range & gets through an unusually large amount of work in a day. He is very neat & careful in the keeping of his records & has given me cause to be well satisfied with him.

/Signed/ H. Lyon Capt^n R.E.
In Chg of 2^nd Range

10^th April 1872.

During the time I have been in charge of the Range I have found Cundasawmy Pillay intelligent and accurate as well as painstaking and have no doubt he will be a useful officer as he gets older.

/Signed/ John Pennycuick Capt^n R.E.
Executive Engr

18^th November 72.

During the time I have been in charge of the Range I have found Cundasawmy Pillay intelligent & accurate as well as painstaking & have no doubt he will be a useful officer more as he gets older. I have been very well pleased with the way he does his work.

22nd March /73. /Signed/ W. Cuningham Capt. & R.E.
Executive Engr. 2d Range

During the short period in which I have been recently in charge of the Dindigul Range, I have found Mr. Cundasawmy Pillay, the Assistant Accountant & writer of the Range to be painstaking accurate & intelligent, and to be fully deserving of his present appointment to which I had much pleasure in nominating him.

/Signed/ R. A. Roberts
Lieut & Adjt R.E.
2d Engr Madura
& Temporary Charge of
Dindigul Range.

Madura
15th April /73

During the time I have been in charge of the Range 12 months. I have always found Cundasawmy hard working, painstaking and accurate. He has a good head & is a tolerably quick & a good penman & can get through a large amount of work in a day.

24th May 1876. /Signed/ V. V. Boddy Lieut R.E.
Executive Engr

Was promoted & brought into this office by me as I had long observed his intelligence, usefulness & careful working with punctual attendance at office at all times: he is well deserving of further advancement.

/Signed/ J. S. Fischer
Colonel R.E.
District Engineer Madura

Madura
18th December /76.

Cundasawmy Pillay has been accountant in the District Engineer's office, Madura, since I have been in charge. and before entirely agree in the opinion expressed by Colonel Fischer regarding him, he is quick, well mannered, punctual and intelligent. I think him deserving of a higher post. He leaves my office now for that of the Superintending Engineer 5th Circle District Engineers having been done away with.

/Signed/ W. S. Harington
District Engineer

Madura
17th Nov /78.

Cundasawmy Pillay was employed in my office 6 months as accountant in charge of the appropriation Registers &c graded as 3rd Clerk. I found him hard working intelligent & accordingly promoted him to be Head Clerk Srichinopoly Division office.

/sd/ J. D. Rundall
Off Supt Engr 5th Circle

21st May /79.

Cundasawmy Pillay has been Head Clerk in this office since 22nd May 1879 & I have found him very hard working; willing and intelligent and in all respects well qualified

During the time I have been in charge of the Range I have found Cundasawmy Pillay intelligent & accurate as well as painstaking & have no doubt he will be a useful office man as he gets older. I have been very well pleased with the way he does his work.

22nd March /73.

/Signed/ W. Cunningham Capt. R.E.
Executive Engr. 2d Range

During the short period in which I have been recently in charge of the Dindigul Range, I have found Mr. Cundasawmy Pillay, the Assistant Accountant & writer of the Range to be painstaking accurate & intelligent, and to be fully deserving of his present appointment to which I had much pleasure in nominating him.

/Signed/ R. A. Roberts
Lt. Col. R.E.
D.A. Engr. Madura
& Temporary Charge of
Dindigul Range.

Madura
15th April /73

During the time I have been in charge of the Range 12 months. I have always found Cundasawmy hard working, painstaking and accurate. He has a good head & is a tolerably quick & a good penman & can get through a large amount of work in a day.

24th May /1876.

/Signed/ P. V. Boddy Lt. R.E.
Executive Engr.

Was promoted & brought into this office by me as I had long observed his intelligence, usefulness & careful working with punctual attendance

attendance at office at all times: he is well deserving of further advancement.

/Signed/ J. S. Fischer
Colonel R.E.
District Engineer Madura

Madura
18th December /76.

Cundasawmy Pillay has been accountant in the District Engineer's office, Madura, since I have been in charge and before entirely agree in the opinion expressed by Colonel Fischer regarding him, he is quick, well mannered, punctual and intelligent, I think him deserving of a higher post. He leaves my office now for that of the Superintending Engineer 5th Circle District Engineers having been done away with.

/Signed/ W. L. Harington
District Engineer

Madura
17th Novr /78.

Cundasawmy Pillay was employed in my office 6 months as accountant in charge of ~~the~~ appropriation Registers &c graded as 3rd Clerk. I found him hardworking intelligent & accordingly promoted him to be Head Clerk Trichinopoly Division office.

/sd/ J. H. Rundall
Offg Supdg Engr. 5th Circle

21st May /79.

Cundasawmy Pillay has been Head Clerk in this office since 22nd May /1879 & I have found him very hardworking, willing and intelligent and in all respects well qualified

qualified for his post.

4th November/79. /signed/ H. Smalley Major R.E.
Executive Engineer

E. Cundasawmy has served as Head Clerk of the Trichinopoly Division office under me for 9 months; He was the Head Clerk on my arrival in August 1880. A more painstaking & hard working man I have seldom met with. He makes himself thoroughly acquainted with all correspondence & writes a good hand & can draft letters well. I believe him to be thoroughly honest.

3283/1

/signed/ C. H. S. Norfor
Offg Executive Engr
Trichinopoly Dn

4th May 1881.

(True copies)

Copies of Depositions

Book 2 months ago I was going to the Division Stores to get a Levelling Instrument for levelling in the Clothamang Town Bank the Cuff Engineer Head Clerk was walking in the Verandah near the Office - he saw me & called me & conversed with me about his Eldest marriage and the extra expences that had occurred during the marriage - He also told me that he has requested the Head Clerk and Accountant of the Division Office to collect a percentage for him - He told me that it is he that had recommended Cundasawmy for the Head Clerks post in the Division and that it was through his influence that Muthusawmy Pandu was transferred from the Examiners Office to this Office. I did this, he said, thinking they would be great friends to me; but now they are not so, he requested me to advise them such to gain his displeasure - I said very well I will inform them & accordingly I did so - /signed/ C.M. Arunachellam Ry
3rd grade Subordinate
15/3/81

I am a Contractor in this District and my name is Lyasawmy Pillay. The Cuff Engineer Manager called me about 2 months ago

ago, during Pongal & asked me if I gave the overseer or the Dy office people any percentage on the Contracts that I get - I replied that I gave nothing - To which the Head Clerk said, Oh all the Contractors say the same, but I believe that the Dy office people get some-thing from you all - Please go & inform the Dy office Head Clerk that I have already spoken on the matter to him & I have also sent word through some other individuals & if he does not yield to my request & give a percentage he will get my displeasure - He also informed me that he gets percentage regularly from the other 4 Divisions - He told me I must bring him an answer soon - I immediately informed the Dy Head Clerk who told me that he would not interfere in the matter - I did not go again to the Superintending Engineers Head Clerk - I informed this to the Division Head Accountant also.

[illegible] G. Lyasvarmy Pillay
14/3/81.

(Office Copies)

328 1/2

Memo No 116 dy
30th May 81.

A.L. 32/5

Bangalore
17th day May 1881.

Colonel R. H. Lanken C.B.
Royal Engineers

Sir

Cotacamund

I beg to be pardoned the liberty which I have in the present instance taken to bring the following circumstance to your notice, in the sincere hope that you will be so good as to bestow towards it a favorable consideration.

I beg to state, that the Bearer of this K. Cundasawmy Pillay late Head Clerk of the Executive Engineer Office, Trichinopoly Division, is as I am informed now dismissed from the Public Service without a just investigation into his Case by the Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle, on the misrepresentation, and under the impression that he Cundasawmy Pillay had brought a false complaint against the

ago, during Pongal tracked me if I gave the Overseer or the Dr. office people any percentage on the Contracts that I get- I replied that I gave nothing- To which the Head Clerk said, Oh all the Contractors say the same, but I believe that the Dr. office people get something from you all- Please go & inform the Dr. office Head Clerk that I have already spoken on the matter to him & I have also sent word through some other individuals & if he does not yield to my request & give a percentage he will get my displeasure. He also informed me that he gets percentage regularly from the other 4 Divisions- He told me I must bring him an answer. Immediately informed the Dr. Head Clerk who told me that he would not interfere in the matter. I did not go again to the Superintending Engineers Head Clerk- I informed this to the Division Head Accountant also.

[illegible] 14/3/81

(three Copies)

P.L. 32/5

328 1/2

Appd. No. 116 dt 30th May 81

Bangalore
17th day 1881.

Colonel R. H. Sankey C.B.
Royal Engineers

Sir

Cotacamund

I beg to be pardoned the liberty which I have in the present instance taken to bring the following circumstance to your notice, & in the sincere hope that you will be so good as to bestow towards it a favorable consideration.

I beg to state, that the Bearer of this K. Cundasawmy Pillay late Head Clerk of the Executive Engineer Office, Trichinopoly Division, as I am informed was dismissed from the Public Service without a just investigation into his Case by the Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle, on the suspicion, and under the impression that he Cundasawmy Pillay had brought a false complaint against the

No 359

Trichinopoly Division Office
4th May 1881.

From

The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Chief Engineer, P. W. D.
through the Supg. Engineer
3rd Circle, Trichinopoly.

Sir

I have the honor to forward in Original (to be returned) the judgement of the Superintending Engineer on the matter of a Complaint preferred by my Head Accountant and Head Clerk against the Supg. Engineer's Head Clerk and request you will be pleased to reverse the decision arrived at by the Supg Engineer and restore the unfortunate men, he has thought fit to dismiss, to their posts -

2 It seems clear to me that the Supg Engineer has taken but a one sided view of the case and has supported his Head Clerk, whose Conduct in interfering with Contracts, he appears to have overlooked - It is obvious that a Supg. Engineer's Head Clerk should have nothing to do either directly or indirectly with Contracts -

3 I am decidedly of opinion also that Paraveodaan

Naidoo did not come to me with the mere object of trying to get Mr Dudley on - I know Mr Dudley; he has often come to me and has expressed his wish of turning Contractor - I have invariably informed him (knowing him to be in pecuniary difficulties) that if he sent in his tenders which he never did & which I never expected him to do, with deposit money, I would give him every Consideration - There was no Special reason therefore for Paraneedom Naidoo to take such a warm interest on his behalf - The impression left on my mind and which I still believe was that Paraneedom Naidoo came to me with the object of getting the Contract for himself in Mr Dudley's name I cannot look upon the matter in any other light - His Conduct in this Case is open to the gravest Suspicion (See Section 410 of the P. W. Code) and yet the Supg Engineer has actually supported him in the matter -

4 My proceedings in starting the Case were perfectly fair and straightforward - I was asked to take and forward the depositions of but two individuals (the Supg Engineer forgets to mention this fact) which I did - I took the depositions of others for my own information & which I was not bound to forward - I do not know for certainty how the Supg Engineer came to hear I had taken the depositions of others but he did come to hear of it, apparently through his Head Clerk who must have been told of it by Annasawmy Pillay or pensioned clerk Muthusawmy Pillay -

5 The enclosed correspondence regarding my office people will go to explain away paras 7 and 8 of the Supg Engineer's remarks on the Proceedings - It is usual when a delay occurs in reply to a reference to call upon the Divisional officer for explanation; instead of doing so the Supg Engineer comes to the Conclusion that the delay must lie with my Head Clerk and accordingly censures him - This sort of proceeding is naturally objected to - I am the best judge of my officemen and I exonerate them from all blame and consider they (the Head Accountant and Head Clerk) have been very harshly treated by the Supg. Engineer -

6 It is not understood why when neither Government nor the Examiner (under whose direct Control my Head Accountant is) thought it necessary to threaten my Head Accountant with removal that the Supg Engineer should have done so in his No 1223 F.C. of 14th December/80, the matter is altogether inexplicable to me - The state of the accounts although said to be on the whole unfavorable are not in such a hopeless state of Confusion as one would believe them to be on reading the Supg. Engineer's letter - My Head Accountant has more work to do than any other accountant in the Circle - We retain Local Funds and the expenditure of the Division including Madura is about double that of any other Division in the Circle - Yet it is only a Second class Division

× marked C

No. 359.

From,

The Offg Executive Engr
Sultye of Lucky &c

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Thro' the Supdg Engr
3rd Circle

Dated 4th May 1881
Received

Encl- 6.

Judgement of the Supdg Engineer 3rd Circle on the matter of a Complaint preferred by the Accountant & Head Clerk of the Div Office against the Supdg Engineer's Head Clerk — Forwards in original the — & requests to reverse the decision arrived at by the Supdg Engr & restore the unfortunate men &c.

Supdg Engrs Office 3d Circle
No. 211 I.C. Ispeikins poly 16th May 1881

From,

Lieut Colonel J. Beatty R.E.
Supdg Engineer 3d Circle

To,

Colonel R.H. Lawley C.B. R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith, by request of Mr Norfor, his appeal against a certain decision of mine, and in doing so I think it necessary to a clear understanding of the case to trouble you with a few remarks upon it and upon the statements in Mr Norfor's letter.

2. I was unable to forward the appeal at once, because I was absent from my head quarters when I received it, and a glance at the papers sent, showed me that Mr Norfor had omitted to

Encls-
1- wrapper containing enclosures & this letter from A to H.
1. Exe- Engrs letter No. 359 of 4th May 81 to the address of the Chief Engr with 6 enclosures-

this man in the quarterly Returns. Subsequently he again recommended Chokalingam for a certain post and stated that if Chokalingum were appointed, Annaswami might be allowed to act for Lautha Pillay in whose place Chokalingam had been acting.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedt. servant

Lt Beatty. Lt Col. RE

Supg. Engineer

× vide enclosure marked H

Establishment

P.W.D. 3050

From,

The Supg. Engineer
3rd Circle

To,

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D. -

No. 211 S.C.

Dated 16th May 1881

Rec'd 20th May.

Encls. 60.

Memo: No. 116 of 30th May/81

Forwarding Appeal
from Mr. Norfor -
against a decision
of the Supg. Engineer.

Sent to Coty 21-5-81.

P.W. 3050/81
16

Establishment

P.W.D. No. 3057

From,
The Supg Engineer
3d Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 211 E.C.

Dated 16th May 1881

Rec'd 20 ditto.

Encls. 60.

Mems: No. 116 of 30 May/81

Forwarding Appeal from Mr. Norfor — against a decision of the Supg Engineer.

Sent to Coty 21-5-81.

2/5/81 CHJ

Proceedings of an Enquiry held at Tpetchinopoly on the 7th April 1881, into a charge made by Head Clerk Cundaswami Pillay and Accountant Muthuswami Naidu, against Head Clerk Para=
=pancoosam Naidu.

The charge is contained in a letter dated 10th March 1881, addressed to the Executive Engineer, Tpetchinopoly, and runs as follows:—

2. "On several occasions the Head Clerk" (meaning Parancoosam Naidu the Head Clerk of the Su=
=perintending Engineer's Office) "re=
=quested us to collect and give him 3 per cent on payments made to Contractors employed in this Di=
=vision."

3. The letter in question was for=
=warded to the Superintending Engi=
=neer, by the Executive Engineer

Mr. C. A. L. Norfor, who stated that
he believed in the truth of the charge.

It became therefore necessary
4. for the Superintending Engineer to
hold an Enquiry into the case; under
para 948 of the P. W. Code.

5. In the presence of the ac=
=cused person (Paraneoosam Naidu)
and of his accusers, the following=
evidence was taken:—

6. 1st Witness; Mr. Fonseca,
Overseer in the Tpechinopoly Taluq,
mentioned in Mr. Norfor's letter for=
=warding the charge,

States that he has no evidence
7. to give in regard to the charge.

Also states, with reference to
8. the matter related
in Mr. Norfor's letter,
that Paraneoosam
Naidu came to him
with Mr. Dudley,
for the purpose of
arranging that Mr. Dudley should enter into
partnership with Chellam baram
Pillay; but the latter refused to
have Mr. Dudley as his partner.

9. Also states that Paraneoo=
=sam Naidu never urged him to
recommend Mr. Dudley for contracts;
and that, finding Mr. Dudley had no
money, he enquired of Paraneoosam
Naidu why he interfered in Mr. Dud=
=ley's affairs; and Paraneoosam Naidu
replied that it was merely to please
Mr. Dudley, i.e., out of friendship.

10. Also that while Arunachel=
=lam Pillay was his worker in the
Madura District, he
(Arunachellam Pillay)
made use of a document
to which Mr. Fonseca's
initials were forged.
Mr. Fonseca considers
Arunachellam Pillay an untrust=
=worthy person.

11. The 2d. witness, Srinivasa
Pillay, third clerk in the Superin=

* Mr Dudley having no money how was it to be expected that he could carry out the work? CH.

The words under lined are by me CH.

† Srinivasa Pillay has nothing to do with the charge under enquiry, but was examined at the request of the accused person Paraneoosam Naidu.

=tending Engineer's Office, called at the request of Mr. Norfor, was next Examined:—

12. States that he has no know=
=ledge of the matter of the charge, except what he has been told by other parties.

13. Cross examined by Muthu=
=swami Naidu as to whether he did not, on several occasions, come to Muthuswami Naidu, and tell him that Paraucoosam Naidu was angry because he did not settle his accounts; Spinivassa Pillay says he knows nothing about it.

14. Asked whether he did not, on several occasions, tell him that Paraucoosam Naidu was trying to ruin him; Spinivassa Pillay says he did not.

15. Cross examined by Cunda=
=swami Pillay.

16. Says he heard nothing about the per centage. But he

heard from Annaswami Pillay that Paraucoosam Naidu had arranged for the transfer of Account=ant Muthuswami Naidu, also for Cundaswami Pillay's transfer on reduced pay; and that Orders would be passed in a week. Anna=
=swami Pillay also said that Paraucoo=
=sam Naidu got Cun=
=daswami Pillay em=
=ployed in the Supg. Engineer's office Madura, and promoted to his pre=
=sent post, and that notwithstand=
=ing this he had shown himself un=
=grateful. The same circumstances were told him by Muthu=
=swami Pillay a pensioned Clerk

17. Spinivassa Pillay does not know the cause of ill-feeling between Paraucoosam Naidu and Cundaswami Pillay,

=1 and does not recollect hearing anything
=about it from any other person.

18. When he heard from Muthuswa=
=mi Pillay about the proposed transfer
=he heard nothing about the reduction
of Cundaswami Pillay.

19. The 3d witness C. M. Aroona=
=chellum Pillay 3d Grade Sub Overseer
in the Ipichinopoly Division was then
called; and the evidence he gave
before Mr. Norfor (vide Enclosure
3) was read to him and he adheres
to it.

20. Says also that no one was pre=
=sent when Paran=
=coosam Naidu told
him to go and speak
to Cundaswami Pillay and Muthu=
=swami Naidu.

21. He remembers that Mr.
Norfor recommended
him for double tra=
=velling Allowance
which was disallowed.

22. He says he was not removed
from under Mr. Fonseca for using a
forged document, but at his own re=
=quest. He says that the cause of
ill-feeling between him and Mr. Fon=
=seca was that he reported to Mr.
O'Rafigan that Mr. Fonseca's Cash
balance was short.

23. The 4th Witness, Nyaswa=
=mi Pillay, a Contractor in the Ipi=
=chinopoly Division, was then called.

24. The evidence he gave before
Mr. Norfor (enclosure 4) was read
to him and he adheres to it.

25. States that his Conver=
=sation with Paran coosam Naidu
took place in the Verandah of the
Supg. Engineer's office and that no
other person was pre=
=sent. He is not a
particular friend of
Cundaswami Pillay or Muthuswami
Naidu, and did not get a house for
Cundaswami Pillay.

26. The 5th Witness, Thiruvaswami Pillay, 2d Clerk in the Division office, was then called. The evidence he gave before Mr. Norfor was read to him. He adhered to it, and acknowledged his signature (vide enclosure 5).

27. The 6th Witness, Annaswamy Pillay, late acting Sub Overseer was next called. His evidence given before Mr. Norfor (vide enclosure 6) was read to him. He accepted it as correct and signed it.

28. Cross examined by Paraincoosam Naidu. Says he never was spoken to by Paraincoosam Naidu about Cundaswami Pillay or Muthuswami Naidu. The latter asked him to give evidence against Paraincoosam Naidu; but did not say what evidence he was to give. Did not tell Spiniwassa Pillay that Paraincoosam Naidu had arranged for the transfer of Muthuswami Naidu and Cundaswami Pillay.

29. The 7th Witness, Muthuswami Pillay, a pensioned clerk was then called, and his evidence (enclosure 7) was read to him and he accepts it as correct.

30. Says he is a friend of Paraincoosam Naidu, and of Muthuswami Naidu and Cundaswami Pillay. Paraincoosam Naidu never spoke to him about Muthuswami Naidu or Cundaswami Pillay. Did not tell Spiniwassa Pillay about the proposed transfers as stated in Spiniwassa Pillay's evidence.

31. The 8th Witness, Govindaswami Pillay, Draughtsman (Assistant) in the Division office was then called; his evidence before Mr. Norfor was read to him and he accepted it as correct.

32. Lastly, Muthuswami Naidu and Cundaswami Pillay were examined by Paraincoosam Naidu.

33. Muthuswami Naidu said his

Dearsay - 4 witnesses know

conversations with Paraucoosam Naidu
26. about collecting money for him took
Dilly place when no body was present.
was 34. Did not understand in what way
he was to make collections from the
ad Contractors; the Contractors receive
sig cheques sometimes from him, some-
27 - times from the Division Officer.
=ns 35. Never receives fee when
wa he hands over cheques to Contractors.
he 36. Says Paraucoosam Naidu
wo asked him for fee on the ground that
as otherwise he would do him some harm.
28 37. That at the time of sending in
=s the Annual Report
ap the Accountants, Pa=
a =raucoosam Naidu
=s told him that the
h Supp. Engineer asked
whether he (Paraucoo=
=sam Naidu) was satisfied with
Muthuswamy Naidu, and that Pa=
=raucoosam Naidu said he was sa=
=tisfied.

V

38. He would not have made a
written charge but that he was afraid
of misrepresentations being made
against him. Admits that Paraucoo=
=sam Naidu by his representa=
=tions can do nothing; but he re=
=presents himself as being able
to do so.

39. Cundaswamy Pillay, the
Head Clerk of the Division Office
was then called:—

40. States that there were no
persons present when Paraucoosam
Naidu asked him to collect money.

41. Does not know how Pa=
=raucoosam Naidu expected him
to collect money. Does not make
payments to Contractors. and
never delivers cheques to Contractors

42. But for the danger of misrepre=
=sentation would not have made written
charges.

43. His brother in law is not a
Contractor directly or indirectly. His

Dismissed

Witness 4 witnesses

wife's sister's husband is not a Main=
=tay in the Division; but one of his
relatives is a Maistry -

List of documents connected with the case.

P.W. 3050/11
17

1. Mr. Norfor's letter.
2. Letter containing the charge
3. Deposition of Annachellam Pillay
4. — Do — of Ayaswami Pillay
5. — Do — of Thiruswami Pillay
6. — Do — of Annaswami Pillay
7. — Do — of Muthuswami Pillay
8. — Do — of Govindaswami Pillay
9. Mr. Norfor's second letter.

C. Beatty
Lieut. Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3 & 6

8th April 81.

Sent to [illegible]

General Remarks on the case, and the decision arrived at, by the Superintending Engineer.

---

1. The Supg Engineer has first to notice that the Offg Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly, acted with great want of discretion in giving his countenance and support to such a charge as this; for by doing so he has simply led his subordinates on to their ruin - A very little common sense should have shown him that the evidence they had to give was of the most worthless character. But he seems to have been blinded by prejudice.

2. And his proceedings, when starting the case, were hardly fair and straightforward. In his first letter he states that he he has examined two witnesses - (Enclosures 3 & 4); and does not produce the depositions of the other four witnesses (Enclosures 5, 6, 7, 8) until these are specially called for by the Supg Engineer -

3. It is also observed that Mr Norfor in December 1880, thought

Peddy - 4 witnesses know

the charge against Paramcoosam Naidu might be a "got up" com: :plaint; but lately, for the reason given in para 2 of his letter ap: :parently, he believes "there must be some truth in it". That reason is that Paramcoosam Naidu endeavoured to get his friend Mr Dudley entrusted with the execution of some work on con: :tract; and although Param: :coosam Naidu did this openly, using only fair means, and failed to get his friend any work, Mr Norfor considers this a reason for believing that the charge against Paramcoosam Naidu is true; ie, that he did attempt to extort fees or bribes.

The Supt Engineer, on the con: :trary, considers this to be, in fact, no reason at all.

4. As regards the specific charge against Paramcoosam Naidu, the most definite state: :ments are those made by his two accusers as given in their joint letter (Enclosure 2), and the depositions of their two prin: :cipal witnesses (Enclosures 3 + 4).

But as, in each case, the wit: :nesses depose to something that happened when nobody else was present, the evidence is, in the opinion of the Supt Engineer, perfectly worthless, and such as would not be accepted in any court of law.

5. The brazen-faced confession of the principal witness (para 22 of the Proceedings), that he had once acted the part of ac: = former against his immedi: :ate superior, is enough to stamp the character of the man. He seems to have brought a false charge on that occasion too.#

6. Again, the charge is that, on several occasions, Paramcoosam Naidu asked Sundasami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu to collect for him 3 per cent on all con: = tracts; and their witness Aya: :sami Pillay further states that this percentage is paid to Pa: :ramcoosam Naidu by all other Divisions. But when Sunda: :sami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu are asked to explain how the collection was to be made, they declare they have not

I believe the charge was not false, I have seen to Ramaswamy Naidu some time ago. Cl.

Pearsey - 4 witnesses Kam

the least idea. How either the charge is false, as the Supt Engr fully believes; or these men were lying when they said they did not know how the collection was to be made. In either case they are untrustworthy and unfit for the Government Service.

7. Then as to their reason for bringing the charge; viz, lest he should do them some harm; ie. by misrepresentations to the Supt Engineer: they are unable to adduce a single instance in which a member of the Office Establishments has been unfairly dealt with.

8. Sundarasami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu are also well aware that what they call the "unbearable threats & warnings" of the Supt Engineer were well deserved, and were in reality nothing more than his reasonable complaints at the excessive and most vexatious delays (such delays as very rarely happen in any other Division) that have repeatedly occurred in the Trichinopoly Division, in furnishing information called for, or replies to references. They know well that they alone, by their inefficiency or negligence, are responsible for these complaints; and that this is a mere excuse, of no value whatever, craftily introduced to hide their real motives. The origin of the whole business was, no doubt, feelings of malice and jealousy totally unconnected with anything in Paramasivam Naidu's discharge of his duties as Head Clerk.

9. As regards the rest of the evidence recorded, the Supt Engr cannot see that it in any way supports the principal charge, that of attempting to extort fees by threats; and he has good reason to believe from enquiries since made that Sundarasami Pillay's Statement (para 43 of the Proceedings) that his brother-in-law is not a Contractor in the Division is false. The person in question is named Annasami Pillay, and this man's sister is Sundarasami Pillay's wife. Two respectable witnesses state that Annasami Pillay was lately a Contractor, if not just now.

by Kistnasami, but it only [illegible] 4 witnesses know

10. On the other hand the accused possesses first-rate testimonials from the following officers:—

Colonels Wilkieson, Lawford, Roberts, and Sankey;

Lieut. Col. H. L. Prendergast;

Major G. H. Payne;

and Messrs. R. B. Dobbs, I. O. Grant, W. Hughes, I. W. Martin, and I. W. Rundall. At the last reorganization, Mr. Rundall specially selected Paramcoosam Naidu for his present post in preference to others of longer service.

11. The Supg. Engr. considers that Sundrasamy Pillay and Muthusami Naicken have totally failed to substantiate the very serious charge they brought against a man of the highest character.

The charge of course was brought for the purpose, and apparently in expectation, of ruining Paramcoosam Naicken. If it had been proved, he must have been dismissed. But the charge has not been substantiated and the Supg. Engineer believes it to be false. He has no doubt that the four persons, Sundrasami Pillay Muthusami Naidu, Arumachellam Pillay, and Ayasami have been guilty of a malicious conspiracy to ruin Paramcoosam Naidu.

12. Such being the case it becomes necessary to decide what punishment is most suitable in the case of conspirators, such as these men have proved themselves to be, so as to deter others like them from engaging in similar attempts to blacken the character of members of the Department in this Circle.

13. The Supg. Engineer considers it his duty to himself, as well as to all his subordinates, to inflict the severest punishment in his power.

Head Clerk, Sundrasami Pillai and Sub-Overseer Arumachellam Pillay will be dismissed from the public service.

Accountant Muthusami Naicker will be recommended to the Examiner for dismissal.

Contractor Ayasami Pillay will not be allowed again to enter into contracts in this Circle.

L. Beatty. Lieut. Col. R.E.
28th April 1881 Supg. Engineer 3d Circle

P.R. 3080/81
76

Memo

On the case reported to Cpn
with S.E. 3rd Circle No 152 T.C dated
2nd May 1881

Accused.

Muthusami Naidu
Asst Trichy Dt

Cundusami - Head
Clerk E. Bs Office
Trichy Dt

Accused

Paramcoodum Naidu
Head Clerk S. Bs Office
3rd Dt

The accusations are:-

1- Prompting to collect three
present on all payments
made to Contractors -

2- Ill-feeling by Accused
towards Accusers.

3- Threats by Accused
Accusers -

Eight persons were examined
of whom all except Fonseca
are named in Accusers'
letter as able to speak
to the accusations -

Accusation 1 - is confirmed
by 2 witnesses, Arunachellam
Sub Overseer and Agadasamy
Contractor: 4 witnesses* do
know nothing about it: and
the remaining 2 were not
apparently asked about it.

Accusation 2 - is upheld
by Kisnasamy, but is only
hearsay - 3 witnesses do

* Amasami
Muthusami Pillay
Fonseca
Srinivasa Pillay
& Kisnasamy
Govindsamy

P.W. 3080/87
76

Accusers.

Kunthusami Naidu
Acctt Trichy Dn

Cundusamie - Head
Clerk S. Bs Office
Trichy Dn

Accused

Paramcoosam Iyadu
Head Clerk S. Bs Office
3rd Dn

Memo

Re the case reported to Exam
with S.B. 3rd Circle No 152 T.C dated
2nd May 1881

The accusations are:-

1- Prompting to collect illeg
present on all payments
made to Contractors -

2- Slt. pulling by Accused
towards Accusers.

3- Threats to Accusers -

Eight persons were examin
of whom all except Fonseca
are named in Accusers'
letter as able to speak
to the accusations -

Accusation 1 - is confirm
by 2 witnesses, Arunachella
Sub Overseer and Agastamu
Contractor: 4 witnesses *
know nothing about it: and
the remaining 2 were not
apparently asked about it.

Accusation 2 - is spoken to
by Kisnasamie, but is only
hearsay - 4 witnesses know

* Arunasamie
Kuthusamie Pillay
Fonseca
Srinivasa Pillay
Kisnasamie
Govindsamie

sent to Duty 21st 81

nothing about any illegality: 3 witnesses were not apparently asked about it -

Accusation 3 is confirmed by 2 witnesses, Govindsami 2nd Offr. B's Office, & Srinivasa Pillay 3rd Cl. S. B's Office: 2 witnesses know nothing of the threats: one witness denied all about them; & 3 others were not apparently questioned on the point -

---

W. Fonseca's evidence may be thrown out altogether as not directly affecting the accusations, though confirming the S Bs' reasons that Paramasivam "had been to W. Fonseca" - His witness's allegations against Arunachalam, and the latter's counter-allegations against W. Fonseca can be worth little - for, if true, it is strange that they are still in Govt employ!

The confirmatory evidence is as follows -

2 witnesses - in regard to Accusation 1

1 witness - (in a measure) in regard to Accusation 2 -

2 witnesses - in regard to accusation 3

Only one witness denied point blank - & that is in regard to accusation 3 -

In other cases, the witnesses say they know nothing; or else they were not asked -

As to the confirmatory evidence - there is laid by the S.B. on the fact of its being mutually admitted, the alleged conversation having occurred between the witnesses & the accused at different opportunities & in the presence of no other parties. (This with reference to Accusation 1.) Considering that the proposal was to extract illicit gratification it was clearly to the interest of the accused, & his interest only, that there should be

nothing about any illoyalty: 3 witnesses were not apparently asked about it-

Accusation 3 is confirmed by 2 witnesses, Corindaine 2nd Offr. B.B. Office, & Srinivasa Pillay 3rd Cl. S.B. Office: 2 witnesses know nothing of the threats: one witness denied all about them; & 3 others were not apparently questioned on the point-

---

W. Fonseca's evidence may be thrown out altogether as not directly affecting the accusations, though confirming the Statement that Paramasivam "had been to W. Fonseca"- His witness's allegations against Arunachalam, and the latter's counter-allegations against W. Fonseca can be worth little- for, if true, it is strange that they are still in Govt employ!

The confirmatory evidence is as follows-

2 witnesses- in regard to accusation 1

1 witness- (in a measure) in regard to accusation 2-

2 witnesses- in regard to accusation 3

Only one witness denied point blank- & that is in regard to accusation 3-

In other cases, the witnesses say they know nothing; or else they were not asked-

As to the confirmatory evidence- that is laid by the S.B. on the fact of its being established, the alleged conversations having occurred between the witnesses & the accused at different opportunities & in the presence of no other parties- (This with reference to accusation 1.) Considering that the proposal was to extract illicit gratification it was clearly to the interest of the accused, & his interest only, that there should be

nothing about any illegality:
3 witnesses were not apparently asked about it.

Accusation 3 is confirmed by 2 witnesses, Govindsami 2nd Offr. B&S Office, & Srinivasa Pillay 3rd Cl. S.B's Office: 2 witnesses know nothing of the threats: one witness denied all about them; & 3 others were not apparently questioned on the point.

Mr. Fonseca's evidence may be thrown out altogether as not directly affecting the accusations, though confirming the Defence that Paramasivam "had been by Mr. Fonseca". His witness's allegations against Arunachalam, and the latter's counter-allegations against Mr. Fonseca can be worth little - for, if true, it is strange that they are still in Govt employ!

The confirmatory evidence is as follows -

2 witnesses - in regard to accusation 1

1 witness - (in a measure) in regard to accusation 2 -

2 witnesses - in regard to accusation 3

Only one witness denied point blank - & that is in regard to accusation 3 -

In other cases, the witnesses say they know nothing of; or else they were not asked -

As to the conversation evidence - there is laid by the S.B. on the fact of its being established, the alleged conversations having occurred between the witnesses & the accused at different opportunities & in the presence of no other parties. (This with reference to accusation 1.) Considering that the proposal was to extract illicit gratification it was clearly to the interest of the accused, & his interest only, that there should be

his witnesses were not biased in the affair, so it was not their interest to prevent lies.

As to Accusation 2 - the hearsay evidence is not worth much & is not confirmed by others & appears to have been relied on by the accuser below notice & animus -

As to Accusation 3, it is confirmed by two witnesses & no counter-evidence is adduced to disprove it.

So far then the weight of the evidence is in favour of the accusers - the only distinct denial being that of one witness in regard to the minor accusation of threatened beating of the accusers -

The S.E. has summed up the evidence & has given his opinion on the case - but has not always adhered only to the facts brought out in evidence, vide his para 7 & end of para 8, & end of para 9 -

His argument in para 6 is illogical - Had the accuses explained how the collections were to be made, they would simply have committed themselves, & the argument might then have been that they had evidently entertained the proposition, & planned its execution, in contradiction of their written statement that "we will never interfere in the matter & that if he wishes he may collect the rebuked personally himself from the Contractors"

The "annual report" referred to at para 37 of the notes of the enquiry, is the Report of the S.E. on the Divisional Accountant - This is forwarded to Examiner commenced by the S.E.

The result of the enquiry is that the S.E. has dismissed Candalami Bhis Head Clerk and Cremated Challan but Overseer - Thes debarred Agacami Contractor

from employment in the
3rd Circle of Superintendence.
With these orders I have
no right to interfere -
He has recommended
the Accountant for
dismissal - In this I
cannot concur - In my
opinion, tho' the accusa-
tions have not been
proved, the weight of evidence
is not in favor of the
accused - the nature
of the main accusation
is scarcely capable of
substantiation - There is
however enough brought
to show that there was
an undercurrent of
scheming & immorality,
& that the Accountant
could have stopped all
this by confronting his
informant, Annachellam
and Agavani, with the
lot & look at the first hint

from them of the alleged
proposal - He preferred to
make a verbal report &
to leave matters to take
their course for a further
period -
I consider his case will
be met by reduction
to the minimum of
his grade of his transfer
at his own expense to any
Office -
As to the Head Clerk of
the S. B's Office, I submit
that he should be trans-
ferred to another circle -
The S.B. acquits him entirely
of further privy but in an
exhaustive Confidential - He
has been in the Office
since November '78 - & has
been contemporary with
his accuser since May '79
& Dec. '79 -

D. C. Conroy

5th May 81 Examiner

Supp.d Engr.s Office, 2nd Circle
Camp Palandoraimedu
14th December 1880
Desp.d 18th

No. 1223 T.C

From

The Supp.d Engineer
2nd Circle

To

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir

I do forwarding the accompanying copy of G.O No. 2689 dd of the 23rd November 1880, I have the honor to point out that it is very discreditable to your Head Accountant Muthusamy Naidu as regards the state of the Accounts in your Division. It is considered of much importance that the work registers should be maintained as correctly & as carefully as possible, & any neglect of this important work is decidedly unsatisfactory.

Please insist upon your Head Accountant attending to the Circulars & instructions of the Seniorities as minutely as possible, & have the accounts prepared in a systematic manner, & should he not exert himself to remedy the present disorderly state of things in the Account branch I will be compelled to request

Encls-1

preference to those who are young and efficient.*

(Signed) J. V Beatty Lieut.t Coll.t R.E.
Supp.d Engineer, 2nd Circle
(True copy)

C Thompson
Offg. Exe. Engr. Trichy Div.n

P.h. 3059/81
5/6

* Chockalingam is not an old man - By this & two Years is not sufficient as he is inexperienced, & must serve before employed as a Subordinate

CH.

No. 1258 I.C

Supt. Engrs. Office, 3rd Circle
Shalatope, 23rd Dec. 1880
Despd. 25th

Memo

With reference to his letter No. 3030 of the 16th instant, the undersigned has the honor to inform Mr. Horsfor that, although Mr. Vincent's stay at Madura was short, Mr. Hutchings was for a long time in Madura, & his opinion of Cholerique pillay is quite sufficient to han this claim for a permanent appointment. In fact he would not have been appointed if the undersigned had been aware of his antecedents in the first instance.

2 Although the words referred to by Mr. Horsfor, viz., "who possess good testimonials," are not in any of the Government orders, the undersigned would remind Mr. Horsfor that it should be the duty of every Officer of Government to select such men in filling up vacancies. It does not necessarily follow that because a man is thrown out by reduction he must be provided for, even without good testimonials, in

x until he has had at least one year's approved Service under another Officer

only a month; & from his remark it would appear that the Sub Conductor's ill health was the cause of his being of little use.

2 Will you please communicate to me the No. & date of the order, in which the words underlined by you in para 2 of your letter, "who possess good testimonials", are printed, as the G. C I have quoted contains no reservations of any kind. I need hardly mention that the Examiner will take exception to Vythinatha Iyer's appointment so long as a thrown out man is available for the post.

Shalatope & co.
(Signed) C. H. T. Horsfor
Offg. Supt. Engr. Circle Dn.

(True Copy)

C. Chester
Offg. Supt. Engr. Circle Dn.

P.h. 3050/81
57

Tuticorin Division Office

No. 3030

16th December 1880
Despd. 17th

From

The Offg. Executive Engineer
Tuticorin Division

To

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir

With reference to your No. 1203 Fc dated 9th Instant (para 3), I have the honor to inform you that I have not a very high opinion of Sub Conveyer Chokalingum pillay as you seem to think I have. I recommend him for the vacant post on the strength of G.O. No. 2341 D. dated 11th October 1880; and as I had heard nothing against his qualifications since his employment in this Division from September last, I have also seen him, & have not formed an unfavorable opinion of him. From the copy of remarks forwarded it is understood that Chokalingum pillay was not well spoken of by Mr. Hutchings; Mr. Vincent to stay in Madura was for

Mr. Norfor is requested to report on
5 Vythinatha Iyer after a three months
trial

(Signed) J. Beatty Lieut. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle

(True Copy)

P.W. 3050/81
5/8

C. Chafer
Offg. Exe. Engr. Trichy Dn.

No. 2839

Trichinopoly 2nd Office
29th November 1880
Despd. 30th

From

The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

A

To

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir

Your No. 1131 T.C dated 23rd November 1880

I have the honor to inform you that G. Sythiratha Iyer, appointed 3rd grade Sub Overseer, reported his arrival on the afternoon of the 26th Instant.

I beg to point out that Sythiratha Iyer is not a thrown out employee; & his appointment is contrary to the orders of Govt. No. 2341 W dated 11th October 1880, in which it is clearly stated that Subordinates, removed by reduction, must invariably be re-entertained in preference to persons not hitherto in Govt. employ.

Chokalingum pillay, whom I have recommended in my letter No. 2198 dated 2nd October last for the appointment in question, is a man thrown out of employment in the recent reduction of Establishment, & to whom a compensation gratuity of Rs. 40 is sanctioned in G.O. No. 1002 8-10-80 (Pension Department).

Ph 3050/81
50

This file shows that references have not been referred to in it. My office people are also blamed.

GH

A.

No. 1566 E.C.

Trichinopoly
2nd March 1881

From,

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

To,

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir,

No. 508
23-2-81

To be returned.

In forwarding the enclosed letter from the Collector, I have the honor to request you will be good enough to furnish me with the information called for in this Office No. 1277 E.C of the 27th December/80 as early as practicable to enable me to reply to the Collector's letter at once.—

2— It is not understood why this information which was called for 2 months ago, has not yet been furnished.— Please submit the reply at once, and explain in full the cause of the delay & who is responsible for this state of things in the Trichinopoly Division which is most disgraceful to it, and no such delays occur in any other office. Some reply should be given at once. It seems to me that it be necessary to remove both the Head Clerk & the Accountant—

I have &c
Signed/ E. Beatty Lt-Col. R.E.
Supt. Engr. 3rd Circle

/True Copy/
C. Clifton
Offg. Exc. Engineer Trichy Divn.

Offg Exe Engineer.

P.W. 3050/81
5-60

Executive Engineer's Office
8th March 81.

No. 614

From,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To,
The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Your No. 1566 T.C of 2-3-81

Culo 13.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith all the papers relating to the claim of one Narayana Iyengar for extension of Kunjah Cultivation under an anicut across the Kodavanaur river in the Dindigul Taluq received this day from the Madura Sub Divisional Officer.

2- The Lake Dindigul Sub Dl. Officer to whom the papers were forwarded for personal inspection of the spot & report appears not to have done any thing in the matter.-

3- The delay in replying to this reference is due to the searching of the documents among the old records both in this & Madura Sub Dl. offices. The records are in a very confused state & the Registers (Receipt & Despatch) of the Lake Madura Division office are not correctly maintained.- References are, in consequence, not easily traceable. Please therefore authorize me to send in an approximate Estimate for the cost of an

Estab.
Cultivation under the Executive Engineer

1 Collectors letter No. 4105 / 23-12-80
1 -Do- -Do- 508 / 23-2-81
1 -Do- -Do- 4451 / 9-12-79
with its 9 Enclosures.
1 Lake Madura Dl. Offices letter No. 2888 / 18-12-79 to the Lake Dindigul Sub Dl. Offices.

13

establishment for bringing these records into some order.- In conclusion I beg to state that I am the best judge as to whether my Head Clerk and accountant should be removed- and I am not prepared to recom=
=mend the removal of either.-

I have &c &c

Signed/ C. H. T. Horsford
Offg Engineer Trichy Dn

/True Copy/

C. Thuson
Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

P. W. 3057
54

No. 1613 T.C.
12-3-81.

Memo

With reference to the 3d para of letter from the Trichinopoly Division Officer No. 614 of 8th March 1881, the undersigned has the honor to observe that the Divisional officer was some months since called upon for an estimate of the cost of sorting all the records of the Division including the Madura Sub Division records and the establishment he then applied for was sanctioned - A special report is therefore now necessary to accompany the proposed supplemental estimate, explaining how it has happened that the original estimate has proved insufficient.-

2- In regard to the ability of the Head Clerk & Accountant of the Trichinopoly Division to carry out the duties of their present posts, the undersigned can only judge of it by the work done which is at present anything but satisfactory whether as regards answers to references, or submission of accounts; but he is willing to await further experience before urging their removal.-

Signed/ J. Beatty Lt-Col R.E.
Supg Engr 3d Circle

/True Copy/

C. Thuson
Offg Executive Engr Trichy Dn

Offg Exve Engineer

P. Dr 3050/81
53

Executive Engineer's Office
16th March 1881.

No. 4179.

From,

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To,

The Superintending Engineer 3d Circle
Trichinopoly.

Sir

In acknowledging the receipt of your Memo No. 1613 S.C. dated 12th instant, I have the honor to invite your attention to this Office No. 1248 dated 15th July last where you will observe that the Establishment asked for was for sorting the records of this District only - The Madura records were not received in this Office until August last so that it was impossible to say at the time the Estimate was sent in what state the Madura records were in - I request you will now apply for 2 clerks on 15Rs a month each for 2 months for sorting the Madura Records -

2- I have already explained to you that my Dy accountant & Dy clerk have been blamed for delays which they are in no way responsible for - and I repeat that I am the best judge as to how they perform their duties - it is also not right to get aside the opinion I have formed of the men directly under my orders -

+ set

3- As regards my Dy accountant it is true that his accounts have been late but as matter of

Offg Exe Engineer

of that they have been take in every Division
in your Circle - The accounts of this Division
have been sent in more punctually than Tanjore
and Timevelly and in fairness to my Accounts
ant, therefore I trust that you have thought
it necessary to contemplate the removal of
these Divisions Accountants also and have
so informed them -

4 - I would draw your attention to this
Office No. 3235 dated 4th January last and to letter
No. 3833 dated 17th February last to the Examiner
P.W. accounts - Copy of which was sent to
you with this Office No. 3934 of 26-2-81 and beg
that my opinions & suggestions be treated with
some respect -

I have &c
(Signed) C. H. T. Horsford
Offg. Exe. Engineer Trichy. Dn.

(True Copy)

C Thurston
Offg. Exe. Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

P.W. 3050/1
52

Reply from the Superintending Engineer
to the Division Officer's letter No. 41 79 of 16-3-81-

Memo

No. 1680 T.C
22-3-81

The undersigned has the honor to
request copy of his No. 1248 of 15th July 1880 -
The Madura Sub Division was then part of
the Trichinopoly Division and Explanation
is still needed as to why an incomplete
Estimate was then submitted -

All the accountants of Divisions
are being treated exactly alike -

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt Col R.E.
Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle -

(True Copy)

C Thurston
Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

Offg Exe Engineer.

Pr 3050/87
57

Executive Engineer's Office
29th March 1881.

No. 4333-

From

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Du.

To

The Superintending Engineer 3rd C.
Trichinopoly-

Sir

Encls - 2-

In returning herewith your Endorsement No. 1680 T.C. dated 22d instant I have the honor to forward the enclosed Copy of this Office letter No. 1248 dated 15th July last to your address I have already explained why the Estimate did not include the sorting of the Madura Records - See para 1 of my letter No. 4179 dated 16th instant - They were not here when the Estimate was sent in by Mr. Branson & it was therefore not known in what order they were in -

The destruction of the old & useless records of the Madura Division was authorized by your Office No. 110 M. D. dated 15th May/80 - The Establishment now wanted is not for destroying old records, but

for the Exe Engineer.

but for putting those that have been retained in proper order—

I have &c

/Signed/ C. H. S. Thorpe
Offg Asst Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

/True Copy/

C. Thorpe
Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

Executive Engineer's Office
15th July 1880.

No. 1248

From.
The Assistant Engineer
In Charge Trichinopoly Dn.

To
The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle

Sir,

With reference to your Endorsement No. 789. J.J. dated 6th Instant on G.O. No. 1483 M. dated 18th ultimo I have the honor to inform you that the services of two clerks each on Rs 15 per mensem for the period of two months are required in order to arrange the records of this District & enable me to determine what records can be destroyed. The several Taluks have been formed into Ranges and Sub Divisions in "by permutations and Combinations" and the result has been that none but the most recent records are in any order at all suitable for present reference.

I have &c.
/Signed/ G. E. Thomson
Asst Engineer

/True copy/
C. Thorpe
Offg Exe Engineer.

P/4 3050/87
50

This file shows that reference has not been referred to in it. My office people are also blamed.

GH

A.

in the year if I then required them. I replied by № 4031 of 5/3/81 that Rs. 3,000 was still required on River Embankments. I did not in this letter urge the money required for Irrigation Repairs.

P/4 3050/87
46

Mr Monson assures me that he will be able to spend all the money now allotted, so that no surrender will be necessary.

I have the honor &c

(signed) C. F. S. Norford

Offg Secretary Govt

In the Dpt of Finance &c

(True copy)

Offg Secretary Govt

In the Dpt of Finance &c

Ph 3050/87
50

This file shows that reference here not been referred to in it. my office people are also blamed.

A.

No 4336
Dr 3 81

No 3393
15/1/81
Despd 16/81

From, The Exve Engr
In Chge of Kitty Dn

To, The Superintg Engr
3rd Circle.
Krishnagiry

Sir,

I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to apply to Govt for a further grant of Rs 3,000 to meet the cost of certain emergent Estimates for River embankment which are under preparation, also a further allotment of Rs 2,000 on Irrigation Reports will be required.

I have the honor &c
(Signed) C. H. I. Norfolk
Exve Engr

(True copy)

C. Hughes
Exve Engr
In Chge of Kitty Dn

P/W 3050/81
49

№ 4220
20/3/81
Despd 21/do

From,

The Offg Executive Engineer
Ln Circle of Trichy &c

To,

The Superintg Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you, with reference to your № 1638. of 17th instant that the allotment on River embankment is Rs 1544 more than required. Mr Monson however has been directed to report if he will be able to utilize this extra amount before the end of the year.

I have the honor &c
(Signd) C. H. S. Norfolk
Offg Executive Engr
Ln Circle of Trichy &c

(True copy)

Offg Executive Engr
Ln Circle of Trichy &c

20/81
45

Ph. 3050/87
48

No 1693 J.C. Superintending Engineer's Office 3rd Cir.
Trichinopoly 25th March 1881

From

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

To

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir,

In continuation of this office No 1638 J.C. of the 17th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that Government in their order No 191 I of the 15th idem approved of the Recommendation of the Chief Engineer and to request that you will be good enough to add the sum of Rs 1000 and 4544 under Irrigation and Navigation works &c. Repairs and Agricultural works Repairs River Embankments respectively in your Accounts of the Current year.

2. With reference to your No 4220 of the 20th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that in your Statement which accompanied your No 3832 of the 17th February 81 you applied for a sum of Rs 11468 under Repairs River —

Embankment which was included in
the General Statement forwarded from
this office but Government have allotted
to your Division only Rs 4544 and as
you now state that Rs 1544 are more than
what you require for the Current year
and that you have directed Mr Manson
to report if he will be able to utilize
this extra Sum before the end of the
Current year I request you will be good
enough to hasten your reply at an early
date so that I may be able to surrender
the Amount to Government in time

I have &c

(Signed) J. Beatty Lieut Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

(True copy)

Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly

P/h 3050/81
47

№ 4336
29. 3. 81

From, The Offg Executive Engineer
In Charge of Trichy Divn

To, The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

3050/81
45

Sir,

With reference to your letter №
1693. S.C. dated 25th instant I have the
honor to inform you that the statement
which accompanied my № 3832 of the
17th February last merely showed the
probable cost on different heads of repairing
the damages done to Irrigation & other
works by the late storm & this information
was called for by you in your № 2257/81
of 10th February 81- In submitting the
statement I applied for no money for
the current year- I stated merely the
amounts that would be spent in this
official year (see my letter № 3832 of
17/2/81 again) I had at the time a large
surplus unspent on River embankments-

In my letter № 3393 of 15/1/81 I applied
for Rs. 2000 on Irrigation Repairs and
Rs. 3000 on River Embankments- The Chief
Engineer replied saying that he would
place funds at my disposal later on

in

in the year if I then required them. I replied by № 4031 of 5/3/81 that Rs. 3,000 was still required on River Embankments. I did not in this letter urge the money required for Irrigation Repairs.

P/L 3050/81 46

Mr Monson assured me that he will be able to spend all the money now allotted, so that no surrender will be necessary.

I have the honor &c

(Signed) C. H. S. Norfor
Offg Secretary Govt
In Sec of Irrig Dr

(True copy)

Offg Secretary Govt
In Sec of Irrig Dr

To

The Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly.

Sir

With reference to your letter No 1475 I.C dated 11th inst., I have the honor to inform you that the Irrigation Chief Engineer in his memorandum No III/2 I.C dated 25th ultimo, communicated with your endorsement No 1471 I.C 10-2-81 has ruled that this Department should attend to Imperial Irrigation works only.

The Padugai Channel referred to, in your letter under reference is not an Imperial work.

I have &c &c

(Signed) C. H. S. Norfor
Offg. Sec. Govt.

(True Copies)

P/L 3050/81 45.

4th May/81.

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division.

Trichinopoly Division who is requested to submit an Estimate for repairing the Paduga Channel, which is evidently not such an insignificant Channel as he represented it to be & some explanation is needed as to how he came to make the report he did.

21-1-81.

/signed/ J. Beatty Lt. Col R.E.
Supg. Engineer.

From

No 3570
29-1-81

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly.

Sir

In returning your endorsement cb 1384 F.C. dated 21st January 81. I have the honor to remark that I have no explanation to offer - I did not describe the Channel as an insignificant one nor do I see any thing in my letter to lead you to believe that it was a petty Channel - You had moreover the Overseer's Report before you on the Channel for guidance - I objected to clear it out on the ground that it was a branch Channel not a petty branch Channel and I based my objection on a Board of Revenue standing order - This standing order refered to branch Channels irrespective of size or importance - You evidently had not the complete file on this subject before you or you would not have blamed me in the matter.

I have &c &c
/signed/ C.H.F. Norfor
Offg. Exc. Engineer

29-1-81

Supg. Engineer's office 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly 11th February/81.

No 1475 F.C.

From

The Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle

To

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir

I have the honor to observe that you are quite correct in stating that you had not described the Channel as an unimportant one - That was merely the erroneous impression I gathered from the Correspondence

2 I am however decidedly of opinion that any branch Channel that irrigates in more than one village should be repaired by this Department, and that the rules of the Board of Revenue were not intended to be applied to such Channels -

3 I have therefore the honor to request you will be good enough to have the Estimate for Paduga Channel prepared & the work carried out by this Department as early as practicable -

I have &c &c
/signed/ J. Beatty Lt. Col R.E.
Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle

Executive Engineer's office
18th Feby/81.

× your No 3570 of 29th ultimo.

No 3852. 9/18/2/81

From

The Executive Engr. Trichinopoly Dn.

To

The Supg. Engineer, 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly.

Sir

With reference to your letter No 1475 I.C dated 11th inst., I have the honor to inform you that the Irigation Chief Engineer in his Memorandum No III/2 I.C dated 25th ultimo, Communicated with your endorsement No 1471 I.C/10-2-81 has ruled that this Department should attend to Imperial Irrigation works only-

The Padugai Channel refered to, in your letter under reference is not an Imperial work-

I have &c &c

/Signed/ C. A. I. Norfolk
Offg. Ex. Engineer.

/True Copies/

4th May/81-

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division-

P/h 3050/81/45

P/h 3050/81/37

A.

Trichinopoly
26th January 1881.

No 159

From.

The Officer Commanding
Trichinopoly

To

The Supg Engineer
Trichinopoly

I has the honor to request that a competent subordinate of his Department may be directed to inspect the Armorers' shop of the 30th Regiment N.I.

The archway inside of this building has completely collapsed and in the opinion of the undersigned the building is in a very dangerous condition.

Requests the favor of this being attended to at once.

(Signed) C. Georges Lieut
Commanding Trichinopoly

No 1412 T.C.

Forwarded to the Executive Engr Trichinopoly Division who is requested to take immediate steps for inspecting the building and for submitting an Estimate for putting in thorough repair. * Any work emergently required may be carried out in anticipation of sanction.

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt Col R.E
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle
29-1-81

(True copy)

Exve Executive Engineer

4- In regard to the 4th para of

* repairs are not here specially alluded to.
CH.

P.Wr 3050/87
44

Encos 3

No 4027

Executive Engineers Office
5th March 1881.

Dept 7

From

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Supg Engineer
3rd Circle.

Sir.

In returning your Endorsement No 1412 T.C of the 29th January last, I have the honor to submit for sanction and appropriation of funds the accompanying Estimate — amounting to Rs 310 for repairing the Armoureis Shop 30½ Regiment Trichinopoly

2. The portion of the building which was said to be in a dangerous state has been pulled down and the work is being done in accordance with the plan and Estimate herewith forwarded.

I have &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Morfon
Offg Exe Engineer

True Copy

C. Morfon
Offg Exe Engineer.

P.W. 3050/43

Encls 4.
To be returned
1- Letter No 403
1- G.C. No 2520 4-9-75
1- Estimate
1- Plan.

Supg Engrs Office 3d Circle
No 1673 T.C. Trichinopoly 22d March 1881.

From,

The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle

To,

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division.

In forwarding the accompanying papers regarding armourers shop, the undersigned has the honor to request that he will be good enough to furnish this Office with the information required by the Station Staff Officer at his earliest convenience as to the probable cost of Constructing a new building on the Standard plan

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt Col RE.
Supg Engrs 3d Circle

(True Copy)

Offg Exe Engineer

Ph 3050/81
42

Executive Engineer's Office
29th March 1881.

No. 4339.

From. The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To The Supg Engineer
3rd Circle

Sir,

With reference to your
No. 1673 T.C of the 22nd Instant, I have the
honor to state that the Construction of a new
Armourer's Shop in accordance with the
Standard Design would probably cost
Rs 2000 - In para 2 of my No. 4027 / 5-3-81 it is reported
that the work is being done in accordance
with the plan and Estimate therewith
forwarded.

I have &c.

(Signed) C. A. T. Monfort
Offg Exec. Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

(True copy)

Offg Exec Engineer.

Encls 4.

1- Estimate
1- Plan
1- Letter No. 403 / 17-3-81
1- G.O. No. 2520 / 4-5-75
with standard plan.

Ph. 3050
41

Supg Engineers Office 3d Circle
No 67 C. Madura 2d April 1881.

From.
The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle

To,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir
With reference to your letter
No 4339 of 29th March 1881, I have the honor
to point out that no work should be
commenced without the consent of the
Military authorities and there is nothing
in the papers received from you to
show that their consent has been obtained.
2. It is true that I authorised you
to carry out any emergent work, but
it would have been well if you had
let the Military authorities know what
this Department was doing on their requisition.

I have &c.
Signed J. Beatty Lieut Col RE.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

/True copy/
Asst
Offg Exec Engineer

Ph. 3050/87
40

Executive Engineer's Office
No. 58 9th April 1881.

From.

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your letter No. 67 C dated 2nd Instant I most respectfully beg of you kindly to refer to complete files before writing to me -

You state that no work should be Commenced without the Consent of the Military authorities -

The Officer Commanding Trichinopoly in his No. 159 of 20th January 81 reported that the building was in a very dangerous state and requested that it be attended to at once - What occasion therefore was there for my obtaining their Consent to do the work which they particularly wished Carried out?

Moreover I informed you so far back as the 5th March last that I had Commenced the work and you then did not think it necessary to ask me if I Consulted

Consulted
~~Consented~~ the Military authorities before putting the work in hand.

With reference to para 2 of your letter I beg to state that it has not hitherto been usual to let the Military authorities know that their urgent requisitions are being complied with.

I have &c
(Signed) C. H. T. Harrison
Offg Exec Engineer

(True Copy)

Offg Exec Engineer

P.W. 3050/81
39

No 588
9-4-81

No 121 I.C.

Memo.

With reference to the letter of the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly, the first paragraph of which was not written in a very becoming spirit, the undersigned has the honor to state that in his opinion no new work or radical alteration of an old one should ever be commenced without or in anticipation of special sanction.

2. In this particular case the work consisted apparently of alterations and improvements of a wash house for the purpose of converting it into an armourers shop, and the Military authorities now request that the matter may be allowed to stand over until a certain decision of Government is given.

it certainly did not. CL.

3. Ordinary repairs if called for by the Military authorities in writing and in the requisition declared to be emergent, may of course be proceeded with in anticipation of sanction; but new works, or alterations and improvements, are on a totally different footing, and the Exec Engineer is astonished that any Division Officer should treat them alike—

4— In regard to the 4th para of

of Mr Stanfords letter, the Supg Engineer naturally assumed that the Divisional Officer was acting with the full knowledge and Concurrance of the Military authorities which it now seems he was not.

5- In reference to para 5 of the letter under reference the Supg Engineer regrets to learn that there has hitherto been such serious laxity on the part of the Division Office, and he trusts Mr Stanford will put a stop to it at once.

6- If the alterations and improvements in question which it appears now may never be sanctioned, and should not have been Commenced, in anticipation of sanction, are in progress, they should be stopped forthwith -

Recd alone
24th April/81

/Sd/ J. Beatty Lt Col R.E.
Supg Engr 3d Circle

/True Copy/

Allupa
Offg Exe Engineer
In charge of Trichinopoly Dr.

P.W. 3050/81
38

№ 308
30-4-81

From, The Offg Executive Engineer
In charge of Trichy Dr

To, The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Vizianagaram

3050/81
32

Sir,

In acknowledging the receipt of your Memo № 121. dt 24-4-81 I regret exceedingly that you should still consider me to blame for carrying out your orders and trust that this will be the last occasion I shall have to write on the subject of the Armourers' workshop.

2. The Estimate does not provide for radical alterations or improvements but merely for pulling down & rebuilding dangerous portions of the building on the original design- The building would require very extensive improvements to convert it into an Armourers' Shop- It is clearly a repair Estimate and cannot be called any thing else-

3. I do not agree with para 3 of your Memo under notice; If I get an urgent requisition from the Military authorities either orally or in writing to execute either repairs or improvements to Military

Buildings I am expected to at once comply with their requisition, see paras 315 & 1139 of the D.W. Code - I am aware that I cannot of my own accord sanction an Estimate for improvements to Military Buildings, but I am directed to carry out any work at once considered urgent by the Officer Commanding the Station -

4. I consider that it was your duty to have informed the Commanding Officer that you had directed me to carry out any emergent work required, and, as the correspondence was between you two, to have also informed him that I was complying with his request immediately you became aware of the fact.

5. I deny any serious lacuity on the part of my office -

I have the honor &c
/signed/ C. St. J. Norfor
Offg Executive Engr.

(True copy)

C. Norfor

Offg Executive Engr.

Ph 3050/37

A.

A.

Ph. 3050/37

Ph 3050/87
37

A.

No. 1238 T.C.

Superintending Engineer's Office
Camp Shaliatope 20th December/80
Despd. 23d. —do—

From

The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle.

To,

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly.

Sir

In forwarding the enclosed letter for your perusal and return, I have the honor to request you will be good enough to instruct the Kulitalai Talug Overseer to inspect the District Munsiff's Court House at Kulitalai and report whether the building can be repaired, and to give a rough approximate Estimate of what will be the Cost for putting it in good order.

Enclosure 1

2. From the Judge's letter it appears that the building is a private one, but as the Overseer is on the spot he can furnish the information required without loss of time

I have &c
(Signed) L. Beatty Lieutt. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer 3d. Circle

True Copy
Offg. Executive Engineer Trichy Dt.

P. No 3050/01
36

Executive Engineer's Office
No. 3377 15th January 1881

From

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dt.

To,

The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly -

Encl- 2-

Sir -

With reference to your letter No. 1238 S.C. 20-12-80 the enclosure to which is herewith returned I have the honor to forward for your information copy of a letter No. 316 dated 9th instant from the Overseer in charge of Kulitalai Taluq regarding the condition of the District Munsiffs Court House at Kulitalai -

I have &c &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Horsfall
Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dt.

(True Copy)

C. Horsfall
Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dt.

P. W. 3050/87
35

Reply from the Superintending Engineer
3d Circle to the Division Officer's letter No. 3377 15-1-81 enc

No. 1389 J.C. 22-1-81

Memo

The undersigned has the honor to request the Executive Engineer to take the earliest opportunity of inspecting the Building and reporting on it himself - When there is an Officer in charge of a Division the report of a subordinate should not be submitted except under exceptional cir= =cumstances.-

The Overseer's report omits all mention of the most important informa= =tion required, namely, the state of the walls and foundations, and a rough sketch with dimensions showing the extent of accommodation available.- If the Executive Engineer considers the building dangerous the District Munsiff should at once be advised to discontinue using it.- From the Overseer's report it is impossible to judge whether the building is really unsafe or not—

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt-Col R.E.
Supdg Engr 3d Circle

(True Copy)

C Allston
Offg Executive Engineer Trichy Dn

P.W. 3050/34

Executive Engineer's Office
28th January 1881.

No. 3551

From The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir

I have the honor to inform you with reference to your memo No. 1389 S.C. dated 22-1-81 (herewith returned) that I am not a little surprised at your letting me that my Subordinate's report should not have been submitted:- As it was at your particular request as conveyed in your No. 1238 S.C of 20-12-80 that the Overseer was asked to report upon the buildings

Encl - 1

I have &c
(Signed) C. H. S. Horsford
Offg Executive Engr Trichy Dn

True Copy

C Clusfor
Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn

P.W. 3050/81
33

3050/81
4

Superintending Engineer's Endorsement
on Division Officer's letter No. 3551
28-1-81.

No. 1440 T.C.
2-2-81

The undersigned regrets to find that he objected without reason through forgetfulness, but requests the Divisional Officer to furnish a more complete report after inspecting the building himself.—

Signed J. Beatty Lt. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer

True Copy

Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

A.

P.W. 3050/87
32

P.W. 3050/87
30

No 4/192

From,
The Officer Commanding
the Fifth Q Survey Co
Sappers

To
The Chief Engineer
3rd Circle
Kirkee

Dated 17th March/87
Received
Encl - 3.

Forwarded in Revised Com-
-plaint against Rai
Head Clerk of the Fifth
Survey Office signed
by the 5th accountant
& Head Clerk & Rai
Divisional Officer—

Head Clerk and Surveyor took place at my house in the presence of Draftsmen Subramonia Chettiar.

3. I have examined Contractor Ayacautty Pillay and Sub overseer Atmachellam Pillay and enclose their evidence almost word by word as given by them—

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant

Officer Commanding
5th Survey Coy

Enclosure 1.

№ 4192

17th March 81.

From,

The Offg Executive Engineer
In charge of Trichinopoly Dy.

To,

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

I have the honor to forward a serious complaint against the Head Clerk of your office signed by the Head Accountant and Head Clerk of this office. They both complained to me in December last regarding the 3 per cent required by your Head Clerk, on all Estimates, but I took no notice of what they told me as I thought it may perhaps be only a "got up" complaint, but lately matters have taken such a turn as to lead me to believe that there must be some truth in their complaint.

Encls-3.

2. It was not long ago that your Head Clerk, immediately the Estimate for the 2nd Barracks was Sanctioned, came to me & begged of me to give the Contract to a particular person. I informed him that if he did get it he would have to abide

× amounting to Rs. 3950

head Clerk. I would be observed from our Service Registers that we never had occasion to such we never had occasion to such complaints during the whole period of our service in the Department.

3. Although this is not our desire to bring complaints against the Head Clerk yet we do so because we are afraid that by the H.C. Clerk's Constant misrepresentations to the Asst. Engineer, we will have some day or other entangled in danger of punishment.

We beg to remain
Most Humble Servants
Your Most Obedt.
Humble Servants

Illegible
Accountant
Trichinopoly Dy. Office
10/3/81

Illegible
H.C.
Trichinopoly Dy. Office.

11/3/81

Enclosure 1.

172

Enclosure 2

To

C. A. J. Norfer Esquire
Offg Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Most Honored Sir

We the undersigned most respectfully beg to bring the following to your notice on the Conduct of the Head Clerk of the Supdg Engineers office and to request that the same may be submitted to the Supdg Engineer for his regular enquiry and final disposal.

2. On several occasions the Head Clerk requested us to collect & pay him 2 per cent on payments made to Contractors employed in this Division. This we brought to your notice some time in Dec last. This sort of dealings being quite against our Conscience we informed him repeatedly that we will never interfere in the matter

Pr. 3050/87
26

Pr. 3050/87
18

Annexure to Enclosure B

1. Correspondence relating to the subscription of Rs 32350 by 4/1/87
Supdg Engrs No 1984 - 50 of 24/12/80 — Do of Offrs Rs 32350 of 4/1/87
Do — — 3934 — 26/2/87 — Do — — 39334 — 26/2/87 under
Do — — 2270 — 15/12/87 — Do — — 18107 — 18/4/87 under
Executive No 29 — 63 of 13/4/87 — Do — — 1. one sum.

2. Do — — Do. relating to Public Buildings which are not subscribed
Supdg Engrs No 1547 — 50 of 28/12/81 — Do Offrs No 600 of 3/3/87
Do — — 1594 — 50 of no date — Do — — 626 of 10/3/87

Superintending Engrs. Office

No. 1547. T.C. Trichinopoly 28th February 81

To,

The Executive Engineer

Trichinopoly Divn.

Memo

Reference- This office Nos. 1803 T.J. & 1344 T.C. of the 22nd November 1880, and 14th January 1881 respectively-

Requests that the report called for in the above in connection with the Public Buildings which are not on his Book may be forwarded at once as the Chief Engineer has sent in a reminder for it.-

2- This is another instance of the very great delay that occurs in obtaining information from the Trichinopoly Division office- The Head Clerk should be warned that if such delays are not put a stop to, it will be necessary to remove him, and put some more efficient person in

his

I have &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Harford

Offg Executive Engineer Trichy Dn

(True Copy)

P.W. 3050/81
28

C. Murfey

Offg Executive Engineer

Trichinopoly Division

Endorsement by the Supg Engineer on Division Officer's letter No. 600 3-3-81

No. 1596 T.C.

Memo

The undersigned has the honor to request the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly will be good enough to report the name of the subordinate more immediately responsible—

It was clearly the duty of the Head Clerk to see that some reply was given within a reasonable time to a requisition of this office—

(Signed) J. Beatty Lt Col R.E.

Supg Engineer 3rd Circle—

(True Copy)

C. Murfey

Offg Ex Engineer

Trichinopoly Dn

P.W. 3050/87
27

No. 626-

Executive Engineer's Office
12 10th March 1881
Dept. 14

From

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

To

The Superintending Engineer 3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir-

In returning your Endorsement No. 1596 T.C. of no date, I have the honor to inform you that I was waiting for Mr. Macalister's list of Public Buildings in the Madura District.

2- You did not call upon me for explanation as to cause of delay in the now submission of this return and therefore no explanation was afforded. If this office failed in its duty to supply information not asked for then I beg to state that your office had equally failed in its duty in not calling for explanation apparently required.

3- You again throw blame on my Head Clerk, but I beg to point out that my Head Clerk does not dispose of my correspondence with you; and in this particular instance

instance if he had drafted a letter explaining the cause of delay I should probably not have passed it, so please therefore do not blame him.

4- I sent you the Return for the Trichinopoly District with this office No. 4060 9-3-81 and therein stated that the return for Madura had not been received. I forwarded this to you as you told me and I believe my Head Clerk also that you wanted it.

5- From the report received this day from the Supervisor in charge of Madura Sub Dn it is understood that in the Madura District there are no buildings which fall within the category of Public Buildings, & which are not on the books of this Office; there are also no unauthorized excidences in that District

I have &c

(Signed) C. F. T. Lorfor
Offg Executive Engineer
Trichy Dn

(True Copy)

Offg Dy Engr Trichy Dn

3050/81
18

instance if he had drafted a letter explaining the cause of delay I should probably not have passed it, so please therefore do not blame him.

4- I sent you the Return for the Trichinopoly District with this office No. 4060 9-3-81 and therein stated that the return for Madura had not been received. I forwarded this to you as you told me and I believe my Head Clerk also that you wanted it. furnished

5- From the report received this day from the Supervisor in charge of Madura Sub Dn it is understood that in the Madura District there are no buildings which fall within the category of Public Buildings, & which are not on the books of this Office; there are also no unauthorized residences in that District

I have &c

(Signed) C. H. T. Lorfor
Offg Executive Engineer
Trichy Dn

(True Copy) C. Thurfor
Offg Asst Engr Trichy Dn

3050/18

P.W. 3050/37
26

My Hd Clerk is here blamed
Hence he was not
to blame.
C.

Dr thus ...
be constituted a 4th Class Division.

This year we have to look after more works in the Madura District than last; the Accountant has been under treatment at the Hospital here.

I have &c
(Signed) C. W. J. Dorfor
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Div

(True copy)

P.W. 3050/37.
18

C. Murfor
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Div.

B

No. 181

Trichinopoly Divn Office
18th April 1881
Despd 19th

From

The Exec Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Examiner of P.W. Accounts
Madras

Sir

Encl-1

In reply to your letter No. 29 S.E. 32 of 13th instant, I have the honor to inform you that there is no doubt that the Accountant has far more work to do than the Accountants of the other Divisions of the circle, but this is only a 2nd class Division; the expenditure in this Division including Local Funds & Madura is greater than the expenditure of any other Division in the circle. I do not, therefore, see how he can be blamed in any way. I have a good opinion of him, & know he works hard. I can't give him more than one Asstt; he also brought this point to the Examiner's notice on his inspection of this Office in October last. So long as Local Funds remain in our charge I am decidedly of opinion this should

Memo to

of the year

5 Under these circumstances I humbly request that you will kindly make such arrangements as the Accounts for March 1881 may be submitted to the Examiner within the due time, while I am engaged on special work of disposing of all the Audit Notes to which I am directed to pay early attention.

6- I beg to add that I would ere long fall a victim to some desease if I am compelled to work at this rate; and I hereby state that I am now partially under the influence of Dyspepsia, for which medicines is being obtained from the Civil Dispensary.

I beg &c
(Signed) G. Moothoosamy Naidu
Accountant - Trichy Divn Office

P.r. 3050/81
19

No. 24
Forwarded to the Examiner of P.W. Accounts for disposal with reference to this Office No. 2 of 17th instant.
(Signed) C. W. T. Gordon
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Divn

(True copy) C. Clugston
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Divn

No. 181

Trichinopoly Divn. Office
18th April 1881
Desp. 19th

From

The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Examiner of P.W. Accounts
Madras

Sir

Memo-1

In reply to your letter No. 29 S.E. of 13th instant, I have the honor to inform you that there is no doubt that the Accountant has far more work to do than the Accountants of the other Divisions of the Circle, but this is only a 2nd class Division; the expenditure in this Division including Local Funds & Madura is greater than the expenditure of any other Division in the Circle. I do not, therefore, see how he can be blamed in any way. I have a good opinion of him, & know he works hard. I can't give him more than one Asstt.; he also brought this point to the Examiner's notice on his inspection of this Office in October last. So long as Local Funds remain in our charge I am decidedly of opinion this should

Memo-2

Supt. Engineer's endorsement on G. O No. 2825
dated 7th December 1880.

No. 1984 J.J.

Forwarded to the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly, who is requested to report without delay on the general causes that may have delayed his Accounts during the past six months, & state what arrangements he has made for submitting them in good time in future without fail.

Similar endorsement sent to all Divs except South and

It may be that the accounts are not closed early enough, or there may be unnecessary delay in the submission of accounts on the part of the Overseers, who should be fined, & if necessary reported for dismissal if they cannot obey orders, or it may be owing to the inefficiency or negligence of the head Accountants; or the Divisional Officer possibly does not arrange to be in head quarters on the proper date for signing & despatching them - These & all other points should be fully reported on -

(Signed) J. V. Beatty Lieut. Coll. R.E.
Supt. Engineer, 3rd Circle.
24-12-80.

(True Copy)
C. Clusfer
Offg. Exec. Engr. Trichy Divn.

No. 181

Trichinopoly Divn. Office
18th April 1881
Desp'd 19th

From

The Offg. Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Examiner of P.W. Accounts
Madras

Sir

In reply to your letter No. 29 S.E. 32
of 13th instant, I have the honor to
inform you that there is no doubt that
the Accountant has far more work
to do than the Accountants of the
other Divisions of the Circle, but this
is only a 2nd class Division; the
expenditure in this Division including
Local Funds & Madura is greater than
the expenditure of any other Division in
the Circle. I do not, therefore, see how
he can be blamed in any way. I have
a good opinion of him, & know he
works hard. I can't give him more than
one Asstt.; he also brought this point
to the Examiner's notice on his inspection
of this Office in October last. So long
as Local Funds remain in our charge
I am decidedly of opinion this should

Memo-1

Similar Indorsement sent to all Divs except South and

Supt. Engineer's endorsement on L. C No. 28256
dated 7th December 1880.

No. 1984 J.J.

Forwarded to the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly, who is requested to report without delay on the several causes that may have delayed his Accounts during the past six months, & state what arrangements he has made for submitting them in good time in future without fail.

It may be that the accounts are not closed early enough, or there may be unnecessary delay in the submission of accounts on the part of the Overseers, who should be fined, & if necessary reported for dismissal if they cannot obey orders, or it may be owing to the inefficiency or negligence of the Head Accountant; or the Divisional Officer possibly does not arrange to be in head quarters on the proper date for signing & despatching them. These & all other points should be fully reported on.

(Signed) J. V. Death Lieut. Col. R.E.
Supt. Engineer, 3rd Circle.
24-12-80.

(True copy)
C. Clifton
Offg. Exec. Engr. Trichy Divn.

Ph. 3050/81
25

No 3235
4-1-81
Despd 5/do

From, The Offg Executive Engineer
In Aye of Sixty Do

To, The Superintg Engineer
3rd Circle
Erichinopoly

Sir,

In reply to your endorsement No 1984. S.J. dated 24th ultimo on G.O. No 2825 D. dated 17th idem I have the honor to inform you that my Head Accountant the one tells me that previous to the amalgamation of the Madura District with this, the accounts of the Erichinopoly Division, as a rule, went in, in proper time, but that since the amalgamation they have not been submitted punctually. He states that the Madura records are in a very confused state & that much of his time as well as that of the office staff is taken up in searching for references &c. I have warned the Hd Asst to be more punctual for the future. I find that the accounts from subordinates come in in very fair time.

The accounts could as easily be despatched from my camp as from Head Quarters, so that my not being at

Head Quarters would not be an excess for the accounts being late. I have signed them in comp. over & over again in other Districts & submitted them to the Examiner in proper time.

I would suggest now that Bradwa is amalgamated with Lichfield that an extra Clerk be appointed to assist my Head accountant. When this District was divided into 3 Divisions there were 3. accountants & 6. Clerks. The strength now is 1 Accountant & 4 Clerks although Bradwa is attached to the District as a sub Division. It should also be remembered that R.E. works are retained by the D.P.W. in this District.

I have the honor &c
(Signd) C. A. F. Norford
Offg Executive Engr
(True copy)

C. Allufer
Offg Executive Engr
In charge of Lichfield Dn

P.W. 3050/77
24

similar endorsement was sent to all the except South except

Supt Engineer's endorsement on G.C. No 706 dated 12th January 1881.

No 2270 J.J

Forwarded to the Executive Engr Lichfield Division, who will be good enough to furnish this Office with a full explanation of the cause of delay in the submission of the monthly Accounts for October & November.

(Signed) J. J. Beatty Lieut Col RE.
Supt Engr, 3rd Circle

15th February 1881.

(True copy)

C. Allufer
Offg Asst Engr Lichfield Dn

Pl. 3859/87
13

Encl 1

Trichinopoly Divn Office
26th February 1881

No 3934

Despd 27th

From The Offg Exec Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir

With reference to your endorsement No 2270 I.J. dated 15th instant, I have the honor to inform you that I have no further explanation to offer than to refer you to my letter No 3235 dated 4th January 1881 -

2 I have also addressed the Examiner regarding the arrears of work in this Office, vide my letter No 3833 dated 17th instant, copy of which is herewith sent for your information.

I have &c
(Signed) C. M. J. Ingram
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Dn

(True Copy)

Offg Exec Engr Trichy Dn

Pw. 3050/87
22

B

No. 3833

Executive Engineer's Office
17th February 1881.

From

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To

The Examiner of
P. W. Accounts
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to bring to your notice that my office work (account branch) has fallen into arrears - Replies to several audit notes and references are to be attended to - This cannot not be done by my Accountant in addition to his Current work - Under these Circumstances I request that you will be good enough to order an additional accountant to attend my Office till such time as the arrears are brought up and the accounts for March next are despatched to your Office.

The cause of the arrears complained of is partly owing to the Local Fund Works not having been excluded from this Division and partly to the amalgamation of the Madura Sub Division with this Division. No extra hands for this purpose were sanctioned for.

I.

I cannot attribute the faults to my accountants or to my Office Establishment as I know they work hard and beyond Office hours.

I have &c.

(Signed) C. A. T. Monfor

Offg Exec Engineer.

(True copy)

Pr. 3050/87
21

Offg Exec Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

No 429 S. E. 3rd

From The Examiner P.W. Accounts
Madras

To The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division
Madras - 15th April 1887

Sir I have the honor to return herewith the Accountants explanation in regard to the present arrears in the accounts work of your office, received with your endorsement No 246 of the 6th instant, & to request that it may be resubmitted with such remarks as you may consider necessary on each of the points adverted to by the Accountant.

2 On the close of the Easter holidays I shall arrange to lend you for a temporary period another accountant, & hope you will with the additional assistance, be able soon to bring the whole of the accounts work of your office up to a satisfactory state.

I have &c
(Signed) D. C. Gardon
Officer in charge Examiner P.W. Accounts Office

(True copy)

Offg Exec Engr Trichy Div

P.W. 3050/81
20

To The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir As directed in para 2 of the Examiner's letter No. 885. S.E. 3rd dated 30th March 1881 to submit full explanations for the delay that has occurred in replying to Audit Notes from June 1880, I respectfully beg to state that the delay is not attributable to laxity on my part in the discharge of the duties, both to the heavy work in the Division, & to the causes hereunder mentioned.

2 The various duties appertaining to me & the cause of heavy work in the Division have been briefly explained in my replies to the several queries embodied in the Examiner's letter No. 800 S.E. 3rd dated 4th March 1881, & also in the list of Accounts submitted to the Examiner from October 1880. The retention of Local Fund works and Minor Irrigation works, which — most of the other Divisions in the

Presidency have not.

3 The Accountant in the Division is allowed only one clerk to aid him in the compilation of Accounts, & partly the amalgamation of Madura Division (the records & Accounts of which are in a most confused state) entail a vast amount of labor, & could not work properly with the limited establishment. With his aid there is hardly time to submit the monthly Accounts to the Examiner within the due date, in spite of working 9 hours every day including Sundays, & other authorized holidays. The main cause of the accumulation of much arrears in this Division & beg to submit that it is coming to the mouth of sufficient assistance; and this I have explained in person to the Examiner when on his tour of inspection in October last, & also the difficulties I have to encounter in the preparation & compilation of monthly Accounts with the aid of one Assistant who could in no way cope with the emergency of the time. Your honor having been an eye witness to the heavy pressure of current duties in the Division you have been pleased to request the Examiner in letter No. 3833 dated 17th February 1881 to depute an additional Accountant to attend this Office till such period as the arrears are brought up, & the Accounts for March are despatched for the reasons therein stated

4- You have now been pleased to direct me to pay special attention to the prompt disposal of several Audit Notes that have been accumulated from June 1880, but in attending to them I fear that the current work would be much retarded, notwithstanding any assistant being vigorously engaged on it. The month of March being the close of the Official year your honor is cognizant of the fact that the transactions would be of a more complicated nature, & the work heavier than in other months

of the year

5 Under these circumstances I humbly request that you will kindly make such arrangements as the Accounts for March 1881 may be submitted to the Examiner within the due time, while I am engaged on special work of disposing of all the Audit Notes to which I am directed to pay early attention.

6- I beg to add that I would ere long fall a victim to some desease if I am compelled to work at this rate; and I hereby state that I am now partially under the influence of Dyspepsia, for which medicines is being obtained from the local Dispensary.

I beg &c

(Signed) G. Moothoosamy Naidu
Accountant - Fiscal's Office

No 24
Forwarded to the Examiner of P.W. Accounts for disposal with reference to this Office No 2 of 4th instant.
(Signed) C. W. T. Gorfor
Offg Acct Exmr Fiscal's Office

(True copy) C Lloyd
Offg Acct Exmr Fiscal's Office

P.W. 3050/81
19

P.W. 3050/81

of the year

5 Under these circumstances I humbly request that you will kindly make such arrangements as the Accounts for March 1881 may be submitted to the Examiner within the due time, while I am engaged on special work of disposing of all the Audit Notes to which I am directed to pay early attention.

6- I beg to add that I would else long fall a victim to some desease if I am compelled to work at this rate; and I hereby state that I am now partially under the influence of Dyspepsia, for which medicines is being obtained from the Civil Dispensary.

I beg &c

(Signed) G. Moothoosamy Naidu
Accountant- Trichy Div Office

No 24
Forwarded to the Examiner of P.W. Accounts for disposal with reference to this Office No 2 of 1881
(Signed) C. Ry T. Jonson
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Div

(True copy) [illegible]
Offg Exec Engr Trichy Div

P.W. 3050/81
19

No 2198.

Trichinopoly 2nd October 1880
Dept 3rd

From,

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To,

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

Reference. This Office No 486 dated 15th May 1880.

Sir,

I have the honor to inform you that Sub Overseer Gopala Iyengar was relieved of his duties in the Musiri Taluq on the afternoon of the 28th Ultimo to take up his Local Fund appointment in the Lalgudi District.

I beg to suggest that Chockalingam Pillay appointed in your No 624 I.C dated 20th August last to act for Santha Pillay 3rd Grade Sub Overseer may be confirmed in the room of Gopala Iyengar and S. Annaswamy Pillay

Compd
DC

Supg Engineer 2 Circle

who was lately employed as Mairtry on Irrigation and Local Fund works, who understands English and who is capable of holding the Sub Overseer's post may be appointed to act for Lantha Pillay.

I have &c

(Sd) C. W. L. Norfor
Offg Exe: Engineer
In chge of Ipieky Dn

(True Copy)

R. Beatty Lt Col RE
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

Compd
DC

P.W. 3050/87
14

21st December 1880

No. 3083. Dept 22.

From,

The Offg Executive Engineer
Ipiekiniopoly Division

To,

The Supg Engineer 3d Circle
Ipiekiniopoly

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 3030, 16-12-80, I have the honor to inform you that Chokalingum Pillay holds very good testimonials, & appears to have been employed as Accountant and Draughtsman, & lastly as Sub Overseer. He is in my opinion, is fully capable of holding the appointment for which I recommended him. The chief cause of his not having been well spoken of by Mr. Rutherings is, I believe, due to his ill health during the period he was employed in the late Madura Division.

2. Under these circumstances I request that you will be good

DVC

Supg Engineer 3d Circle -

enough to appoint him (Chokalin-
=gum pillay) permanent Sub Overseer
in the place of Sasha Iyengar,
whose Services were dispensed
with under the orders of the late
Supg Engineer (No. 807 I.C dated
6th January last).

3. If this is approved by you
I request that S. Annasamy Pillay
whom I have recommended in my
letter No. 2198 dated 2d October
1880, may be appointed to act for
Santha pillay during his absence
on special duty.

I have &c

(Sd) C. H. L. Norfor
Offg. Sub-Engr Ipoh Dn

(True Copy)

J. Beatty Lt-Col RE
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

P.H. 3050/81
13

Compd
BR

No. 1323 I.C

Supg Engrs Office 3d Circle
Ipoh Sitiawan Sub Dn
Ipoh 8th January 1881

Memo

His letter No. 3083 of the 21st
December 1880

Under the circumstances re-
=ported in the above letter the
undersigned sanctions the pro-
=posals recommended by Mr.
Norfor. Chokalingam Pillay's
appointment in place of Seshien-
=gar will be on probation for 6
months and if at the end of that
period he is reported upon fa-
=vorably he will be confirmed
in the post.

Annasamy Pillay will
act for Santha Pillay until
further orders.

(Sd) J. Beatty Lt-Col RE
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

(True Copy)

J. Beatty Lt-Col RE
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

Compd
BR

Ph. 3050/01
12

H

Copies of correspondence
regarding Sub Overseer
Cho Kalingam Pillay
and Annasawmy Pillay

Ph. 3050/01
12

G

Extract from the
Superintending Engineer's
letter to the Chief Engineer
P. W. D. regarding the
Tangore Accountant.

Ph. 3050/11
12

H

Copies of correspondence
regarding Sub Overseer
Chokalingam Pillay
and Annasawmy Pillay

Ph. 3050/11
12

G

Extract from the
Superintending Engineer's
letter to the Chief Engineer
P. W. D. regarding the
Tanjore Accountant.

Extract from a letter from the Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. dated Thaton 14th February 1881 No. 2265 J.J.

× × ×

If the Accountant of the Zaygore Division does not complete his accounts in good time in future, I shall request the Examiner to transfer him elsewhere on a reduced pay.

× × ×

(True Extract)

L. Beatty. Lt. Col. R.E.
Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

Compd
DC

P.W. 3050/81
11

F

Copy of letter to the Executive Engineer Zimewelly Division regarding accounts.

Extract from a letter from the Supt. Engineer 3d. Circle to the Chief Engineer P. W. D. dated Robert 14th February 1881 No. 2265 J.J.

× × ×

If the Accountant of the Tanjore Division does not complete his accounts in good time in future, I shall request the Examiner to transfer him elsewhere on a reduced pay.

× × ×

(True Extract)

L. Beatty. Lt. Col. R.E.
Supt. Engineer 3d. Circle

Compd.
DC

Supt. Engineer Pwd 3d Circle
Camp Pelandoray.
No. 763 dt 14th December 1880
Despd. 18th - do —

From

The Superintending Engineer
3d Circle.

To,

The Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division

Sir,

In forwarding the enclosed copy of G.O No. 2689 W of the 23d November 1880 I have the honor to request you will be good enough to furnish the explanation called for in para 4 of the G.O as to the cause of deposits of previous years not being utilized and the report called for in clause 2 of the same para as to why the expenditure of manner Amount has not been recorded in the Register of works since april last; the name of the person responsible for this neglect, should also be furnished at an early date — Any explanations you may wish to make about the seeming neglect on your part should be furnished as soon as possible for Submission to the Chief

Engineer

2. I shall be obliged by your also reporting how the jail accounts are now kept, and what arrangements can be made to meet the suggestions of the Examiner in order to curtail the amount of labor in maintaining the Register of works, and why no work vouchers have been submitted with the accounts of the Palamcottah jail.

(signed) J. J. Beatty Lieut Colln
Supt Engr 3d Circle.

1 True copy

J. Beatty. Lt Col. RE
Supt Engineer 3d Circle

P.W. 3050/81
11

F

Copy of letter to the
Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division
regarding accounts -

P.W. 3050/81
10

E

Copy of letter to
the Executive Engineer
South Arcot Division
regarding the Head
Accountant of that
Division -

P. W. 3050/81
11

F

Copy of letter to the
Executive Engineer
Tinnevelly Division
regarding accounts.

Superintending Engineer's Office.
3rd Circle Trichinopoly
No. 1093 Dt 19th March 1881
Despd 19th — do —

From,
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

To
The Executive Engineer
South Arcot Division

Sir,

With reference to your
No. 141 of the 24th February 1881 I
have the honor to inform you
that the Register of works for works
below Rupees 10000 must be retained
in all Divisional Offices as prescribed
in the New Code. It is not intended
that the accountants in each Divisional
Office should be left alone to compile
the accounts of a Division. One clerk
should be left entirely at the disposal
of the accountant and if this is found
insufficient the Storekeeper who has
comparatively little to do in his own
Department should be ordered to
assist the accountant with these
assistants the accountant should be
able to maintain the Registers of

works to and if he cannot do this it will be advisable to ask the Yeamen to transfer him elsewhere and send a man who has been found up to such work.

2 I have further to point out to you that if the Storekepers place in a Divisional Office has been filled in by a thrown out Head accountant, the services of this man will be of great apistance to the accountant.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt Servt.
/signed/ J Bentty Lieut Colnl R
Supt Engineer 3d Circle.

/ True Copy /
L. Beatty. Lt Col R.E
Supt Engineer 3d Circle

Ph. 3050/81
10

E

Copy of letter to
the Executive Engineer
South Arcot Division
regarding the Head
Accountant of that
Division -

Ph. 3050/81
9

D

Copy of G. O. P.W.D.
of 1875 - Regarding
Norfor -

P.W. 3050/87
10

E

Copy of letter to
the Executive Engineer
South Arcot Division
regarding the Head
Accountant of that
Division -

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
P. W. Department. 7th May 1875.

Read the following letters:—

No. 148. From J. W. Dundas Esqre.
District Engineer, Tinnevelly, to Colo.
G. N. Walker R.E., Chief Engineer
P. W. Deptt., dated Palamcottah, 20th
March 1875, No. 192.

I have the honor to inform you
that Mr. C. Norfor Assistant Engineer
in charge of the Courtallum Sub-di=
=vision has in a letter, dated the 17th
Instant, requested that I would apply
to you for his transfer to another Zamil
District.

2. Mr. Norfor states that he
desires this change "on account of the
ill health he has experienced in this
district off and on".

3. I have never known Mr. Norfor
to be under medical treatment, and
am disposed, therefore, to attribute
his desire for a transfer to his having
been censured by me for sending in

certain Irrigation Repair Estimates, many details of which were quite unintelligible.

4. Should you wish to see these Estimates as a specimen of Mr. Norfor's capacity, I will forward them to you, but otherwise hardly like to trouble you with them.

5. As the district will not be weakened by Mr. Norfor's transfer to another, I beg to recommend it.

6. As the northern range has but little new work, either Imperial or Local, and as Mr. Superintendent Leslie has prepared more Estimates for Agricultural Repair Works than it is probable we shall have funds to carry out during the next two years, I would propose to transfer him to the Shermadevi Range as Sub-division Officer, and hold the Steeveliliputur Sub-division in abeyance for the present.

7. Mr. McNair, the Northern Range Officer, is thoroughly acquainted with the Range, and will, as long as the allotments are as low as they are likely to be next year, be able to superintend all work.

No. 149. From the same Officer, dated Camp at Puthugudi, 9th April 1875.

No. 10.

I have the honor, at the request of Mr. C. Norfor, Assistant Engineer, attached to this District, to forward, herewith, a letter to your address, with two enclosures.

1. List of Documents (containing six enclosures).

2. Mr. Norfor complains, firstly, that I misrepresented him in stating that his application for a transfer was due to his having been censured rather than to ill health.

3. The reasons for my opinion were that Mr. Norfor's application was written on the day he received the Censure referred to, and that I had never known him either under Medical treatment or suffering from ill health.

4. Mr. Norfor complains, secondly, that I have "ventilated his inefficiency" to Officers of Revenue Department, and forwards copies (including one letter of his to me, written but never sent) of correspondence with regard to two

cases in which I blamed him, and in which when the Collector and Sub Collector found fault with the departmental work, I stated when replying to them that Mr. Norfor being inefficient I could not be responsible. I shall feel that I should be very sorry to be held responsible for the manner in which Mr. Norfor performs his duties.

5. As a further reference on the subject of Mr. Norfor's inefficiency has now been made by Mr. Norfor himself, I forward, though reluctantly, the Estimates referred to in my letter, No. 192, of the 20th March. In my memo these Estimates and Mr. Norfor's explanations show that he is unfit for the post he holds. If Mr. Norfor would in cases like this take his Estimates to the Range Officer and prepare Estimates under his instructions, there would be some hope for him; but he insists on doing things his own way generally does them wrong, and when found fault with considers himself ill treated.

6. I should mention that these Estimates were called for by the additional Sub Collector who had inspected the works referred to and noted generally what appeared to him to be wanted.

7. The Estimates, my notes in returning them, and Mr. Norfor's replies are forwarded.

8. The Estimates were sent in by Mr. Norfor without any explanation or description of what was either wanted or proposed.

9. In one place Mr. Norfor Estimates for a Masonry Revetment wall to protect a channel from erosion 3 feet thick for a height of 2½ feet. This is marked (a) on the Estimate and Notes. Although I pointed out that this could hardly be required, Mr. Norfor still considers such a thickness "absolutely necessary".

10. In another case marked (b) Mr. Norfor Estimates for a thickness of 10 inches with a height of 3 feet. This is probably a mistake, as a different thickness and different height also is entered in the Specification.

I mention this to show how very trouble=
=some it is to revise Mr. Norfor's Es=
=timates and correct his complicated
errors.

11. Mr. Norfor estimated for mass=
=ses of Concrete (to stop leakage) -
without any reference to what they
are to be founded on; and, if made
in accordance with either his first
or his amended Specification, the
Concrete would certainly be a
failure.

12. In the case of certain Estimates
for repairing the irrigation works of
Kharapanadi river, I went over the works
with Mr. Norfor and gave him full
notes regarding the preparation of
the Estimates. When received these
were also in many cases unintelli=
=gible, and had to be revised by Mr.
Grant.

13. Similarly most of Mr. Norfor's
Estimates require as much trouble
expended in revising them as would
suffice to make them out originally;
hence in this respect at least he is
of no assistance to his Range Officer.

14. Were I remaining in the district,
and not about to go on furlough, I should
venture to make Mr. Norfor's removal
a special request, as I have no hope
of his being a useful member of the
district staff.

Order thereon, 7th May 175 No. 1294

No. 150

Establishment No. 16 - Mr. Norfor's re=
=quest for removal
to another district will be complied with,
as it is contemplated by the District
Engineer to hold the Streeville sub=
=division in abeyance. But from peru=
=sal of the correspondence sent up to
the Chief Engineer, at Mr. Norfor's
own request, on this and on a former
occasion, His Excellency the Governor
in Council has been led to form a most
unfavorable opinion of that gentleman's
competence for the work of the Depart=
=ment. And finding that his name
stands high on the roster for promotion
to a senior grade, he considers it nec

=sary that his period of probation
shall be extended before he attains
it. He will consequently be reduced
in rank to a place amongst the
Assistant Engineers of the 2nd Grade
Just above the gentlemen who have
lately been appointed from Coopers
Hill; and he is warned not to expect
promotion to the first grade till
reported by competent authority fit
for Range charge. Further report of
continued incompetence will involve
dismissal from the Department.

2. The Chief Engineer will ar=
=range for his further employment.

(True Extract)
(Signed)

G. W. Walker Col. RE.
Secretary to Govt.

(True Copy)

R. Beatty. Lt Col. RE.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

Ph. 3050/81
9

D

Copy of G. O. S.W.D.
of 1875 - Regarding Mr.
Norfor -

Ph. 3050/81
8

C

Supy Engineers
Revised Decision

Pr. 3050/81

D.

Copy of G. O. P. W D.
of 1876 - Regarding Mr.
Norfor -

Revised Decision in the matter
of the charge brought by the Head Clerk
Cundaswami Pillay and Head Account-
-ant Muthuswami Naidu of the Ipeche-
-nopoly Division against Paramcoo-
-sam Naidu Head Clerk Superintending
Engineer's Office.

To meet the wishes of the
Examiner; and taking into consideration
the strong feeling displayed by Mr.
Norfor against Paramcoosum Naidu
which probably misled and tempted
his Subordinates, the Supg. Engineer
has decided to modify and moderate
the sentence he pronounced on the
persons engaged in the recent false
charge against Paramcoosum Naidu.

Cundaswami Pillay lately
Head Clerk Ipechinopoly Division
will be reduced from a pay of Rs 60
in Ipechinopoly to Rs 40, as Second
Clerk in South Arcot Division Office.

Arunachellam Pillay Sub
Overseer 3d Grade will be suspend-
-ed for one month and transferred

Vide demi official dated 4th May 187-

to the Musiri Sub Division; a Sub Overseer of the 3d. grade being transferred from Musiri to Pichinopoly to take his place.

Muthuswame Nadar will be transferred to the Examiner's Office on a reduced pay of Rs 40, but will do duty in the Pichinopoly Division Office until he is relieved

The original decision will hold good as regards Contractor Iyaswame Pillay.

R. Beatty. Lt. Col. RE.
Supy Engineer 3d Circle

Rhodehanel
12th May 1881

181

Avais

for-

P.Nr. 3050/81
8

C

Supg Engineer's
Revised Decision

P.Nr. 3050/81
1

B

Denies Appeal
letter from the
Examiner -

P.Ir. 3050/81
8

C

Supg Engineers
Revised Decision

181

P.Ir. 3050/81
1

B

Denie Official
letter from the
Examiner -

Assis

for.

P.W. 3050/81
1

B

Demi Official
letter from the
Examiner -

3 Enclosure. 3. 1/12.

About 2 months ago as I was going up to the Dist. Stores to get a Levelling Instrument to be lending in the Kottawatta Aban Tank the Supt: Engr. Head Clerk was walking in to Mannaar near the Office he saw me & Mudnee & Conversed with me abt: his Sisters marriage and the Extra Expenses that had occured during the marriage - he also told me that he has appointed the Head Clerk & Accountant Dist. Office to collect a percentage for him

Ph. 3050/81
1

He held me that it is he that has recommended Cumdasamy for the H.C. Clerks Post in this Div.n and that it has through his influence that Muthusamy handed his papers from the Examiner's office to this office - I told them, I had nothing to do with it, but now they are not to make enquiries of me & advise them & join his displeasure - I told they will take steps upon them and accordingly I did so.

Ph. 3050/81
6

15/3/81

Ch. Prod. Mudaliyar
" 3d Gr. Interpreter

2 Enclosure to No. 69.

I am a Cultivator in this District my surname is Ignasamy Pillay - the Supt: of Irrigation called me abt: 2 months ago, during August & told me if I gave to Rasen who Div.n Office people any percentage on the Contracts that I get - I replied that I gave nothing - to which he told me, that all the Contractors pay the same - but I believe that the Div.n Office people get something from Div.n office - please look into the matter & thereby I spoken unto him & I have also sent - word through some other in-

P.R. 3050/81
1

dividends & if he does not
yield to my request & give
a favourable reply he will get
my displeasure - He also
informed me that he got
favourable reply from
the other 4 Divisions -
He told me he must bring
him an answer soon - I
immediately informed the Dist
Asst Clerk - He told me that
he had nothing to do in the
matter. I did not go upon
the Supt: & Head Clerk -
I informed this to the Dist Head Asst:
also -

6th/14/3/81 G. Ramaswamy Pillay

P.R. 3050/81
5

Enclosure 5

I went to Muthusamy Pillay
house abt: 10 days before, when I
saw the Muthusamy Canarese
wife Seeneeroo a Telugu and
Amoorasamy Pillay & I sent him
to tell them that Seeneeroo a Telugu
Cundasamy Pillay & Sorka-
niama Pillay are first-born -
& this is to come & fetch the
Register to the Asst Clerk of the
Supt: Office - I left the
house & told to other two individuals
I mean Seeneeroo Pillay & Amasamy Pillay
the Canarese -

Whistuasamy
2nd Clerk Dist Office

14/3/81 -

P.R.
28/3/81

P.R. 3050/81
1

P.R. 3050/
4

Enclosure 6

I did not hear Pensioned Clerk
Matthewson say Pilcz tell anybody
that to Mr Clark the Supt: Eps Efficiency
Md Shine that to Bird: Mr Asst:
and Mr Clark not know
Complied with his request - that
Selby Spec Asst or all Sots: Their
he was going to recommend
handed the Supt: Eps: but I
heard him say that Messrs a-
lexander was going to be ex-
tended in the Supt: Eps
near appointment - I heard
him about a week ago Matthe-
son ~~I did not hear~~ Pilcz informed him
Saw Pilcz informed him
Shenewood Pilcz informed him
(Matthewson) home - I was
outside at the post - I do not-

P.Pr. 3050/81
1

know what they were talking about -

This is Annasamy's mark
signed
Annasamy Pillay

P.Pr. 3050/81
3

26/3/81

L.D.-

28/3/81

Enclosure 8
Enclosure 7

about 10 days ago Annasamy Pillay Govindin Samy Pillay & Thendrayan Pillay & Kistnasamy Pillay came to my house & told me a story. I did not mention his ~~name~~ Annasamy Pillay's name to the Supt: Gen Manager's name in Connection with any matters - They used to be great friends but I do not know if they are so now - I did not mention to Dist- Head Accts' name to any body that day. I saw afterwards Pongalayan Naidoo

A. Thottanna
L.D. 28/3/81

P.W. 3050/81
1

P.W. 3050/81
2

Enclosure 8

I Send from Muthusamy Pillay that the Supt: Gi Office Mr Clerk has letter wherein that he had given sufficient sittings to Kandasamy Pillay, Mr Clerk who did Office and he has spoken the gentleman abt: Lucia & he has also consented to have her as adviced by Mr Supt Lucia as informed that he has Very Soon - He informed the Govt: also made a report - the Govt: abt: Muthusamy Naidoo & that his Lucia he has send & that Lucia Calls Effect Very Soon.

J. Kandasamy Pillay

14-3-81

L.D. 28/3/81

L.D. 28/3/80

EXAMINER
APR 81
PATENT OFFICE

P.h. 3050/81
1 to 6.

A

(6.) Original Depositions
taken by Mr. Norfor.

No 4192. 17th March 181.

From,

The Offg Excess Engineer
In charge of Trichinopoly
Dy-

To,

The Superintending Engineer
IIIrd Circle, Trichinopoly

Encls: 3.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward a serious complaint against the Head Clerk (Paramcoosam Pandya) of your office signed by the Head Accountant (Subbusami Naidu) and Head Clerk (Cundasami) of this office. They both complained to me in December last regarding the 3 per cent required by your Head Clerk, on all Estimates, but I took no notice of what they told me as I thought it may perhaps be only a "got up" complaint, but lately matters have taken such a turn as to lead me to believe that there must be some truth in their complaint-

2. It was not long ago that your Head Clerk, immediately

for the purpose, and apparently in expectation of ruining Paramcoosam Naidu. If it had been proved, he must have been dismissed. But the charge has not been substantiated and the Supt. Engineer believes it to be false. He has no doubt that the four persons Sundarasami Pillay, Muthusami Naidu, Arumachellam Pillay, and Ayasami Pillay have been guilty of a malicious conspiracy to ruin Paramcoosam Naidu.

12. Such being the case it becomes necessary to decide what punishment is most suitable in the case of conspirators, such as these men have proved themselves to be, so as to deter others like

10. On the other hand the accused possesses first-rate testimonials from the following officers:—

Colonels Wilkieson, Lawford, Roberts, & Lankey;

Lieut Col. H. L. Prendergast;

Major G. M. Payne;

and Messrs R. C. Dobbs, I.D. Grant, W. Hughes, I.W. Martin, and I. W. Rundall. At the last reorganization, Mr. Rundall specially selected Paramcoosam Naidu for his present post in preference to others of longer service.

11. The Supt. Engineer considers that Sundarasamy Pillai and Muthusami Naidu have totally failed to substantiate the very serious charge they brought against a man of the highest character. The charge of course was brought

Sundarasami Pillay and Sri:
: Thusami Naidu are asked to
explain how the collection
was to be made, they declare
they have not the least idea.
how either the charge is false,
as the Supt Engineer fully
believes; or these men were
lying when they said they
did not know how the collection
was to be made. In either
case they are untrustworthy +
unfit for the Government
Service -

7. Then as to their reason
for bringing (written?) the charge; viz) lest
he should do them some
harm; ie, by misrepresentations
to the Supt: Engineer; they are
unable to adduce a single
instance in which a member
of the Office Establishment
has been unfairly dealt with.

8. Sundarasami Pillay

not be accepted in any court
of law.

5. The brazen-faced con-
-fession of the principal
witness (para 22 of the Proc:
: eedings), that he had once
acted the part of informer
against his immediate
superior, is enough to stamp
the character of the man.
He seems to have brought a
false charge on that occasion
too -

6. Again the charge is that
on several occasions Paran:
: coosam Naidu asked Sunda:
: sami Pillay and Muthusami
Naidu to collect for him 3
per cent on all contracts;
and their witness Ayasami
Pillay further states that
this percentage is paid to
Parancoosam Naidu by all
other Divisions - But when

witnesses (Enclosures 3 + 4); and does not produce the depositions of the other 4 witnesses (Enclosures 5, 6, 7, 8) until these are specially called for by the Supt Engineer.

3. It is also observed that Mr Norfor in December last, thought the charge against Paraneeosam haidu might be a "got up" complaint; but lately, for the reason given in para 2 of his letter apparently, he believes "there must be some truth in it". That reason is that Paraneeosam haidu endeavoured to get his friend Mr Dudley entrusted with the execution of some work on contract; and although Paraneeosam haidu did this openly, using only fair means, and failed to get his friend any work, Mr Norfor considers this is a reason for believing that the charge against Paraneeosam haidu is true; ie, that he did attempt to extort fees or bribes. The Supt Engineer, on the contrary, considers this to be in fact no reason at all.

4. As regards the specific charge against Paraneeosam haidu, the most definite statements are those made by his two accusers as given in their joint letter (Enclo: 2), and the depositions of their two principal witnesses (Enclosures 3 + 4). But, as in each case the witnesses depose to some-thing that happened when nobody else was present, the evidence is, in the opinion of the Supt Engineer, perfectly worthless, and such as would

not be accepted in any court of law.

5. The brazen-faced confession of the principal witness (para 22 of the Proceedings), that he had once acted the part of informer against his immediate superior, is enough to stamp the character of the man. He seems to have brought a false charge on that occasion too.

6. Again the charge is that on several occasions Paraniccoosam Naidu asked Kunda Sami Pillay and Muthusami Naidu to collect for him 3 per cent on all contracts; and their witness Ayasami Pillay further states that this percentage is paid to Paranicoosam Naidu by all other Divisions - But when

41. Does not know how Paraniccoosam Naidu expected him to collect money. Does not make payments to Contractors, and never delivers cheques to Contractors.

42. But for the danger of misrepresentation would not have made written charges.-

43. His brotherinlaw is not a Contractor directly or indirectly. His wife's sister's husband is not a Maistry in the Division; but one of his relatives is a Maistry.-

---

List of documents connected with the case.

1. Mr Norfor's letter.
2. Letter containing the charge.
3. Deposition of Arumachellam Pillay.
4. ——— Do ——— of Ayasami Pillay.
5. ——— Do ——— of Krishnasami Pillay.
6. ——— Do ——— of Annasami Pillay.
7. ——— Do ——— of Muthusami Pillay.
8. ——— Do ——— of Govindasami Pillay.
9. Mr Norfor's 2d letter.

L. Beatty - Lieut Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

28th April 1881.

ill-feeling between him and Mr. Fonseca was that he reported to Mr. O'Ratigan that Mr. Fonseca's Cash balance was short.

23. The 4th Witness, Ayasami Pillay, a Contractor in the Trichi: Monopoly Division, was then called.

24. The evidence he gave before Mr. Norfor (Enclosure 4) was read to him and he adheres to it.

25. States that his conversation with Paraneoosam Naicken took place in the Verandah of the Supt. Engineer's Office and that no other person was present. He is not a particular friend of Kundasamy Pillay or Muthusami Naidu, and did not get a house for Kundasami Pillai.

26. The 5th Witness, Krishnasami Pillay, 2nd Clerk in the Division Office, was then called. The evidence he gave before Mr. Norfor was read to him. He adhered to it, and acknowledged his signature. (vide Enclosure 5)

27. The 6th Witness, Annasami Pillay, late acting Sub Overseer was next called. His evidence given before Mr. Norfor (vide Enclosure 6) was read to him. He accepted it as correct and signed it.

28. Cross examined by Paraneoosam Naicken. Says he never was spoken to by Paraneoosam Naicken about Kundasamy Pillay or Muthusami Naicken. The latter asked him to give evidence against Paraneoosam Naicken; but did not say what evidence he was to give. Did not tell Srinivasa Pillay that Paraneoosam Naicken had arranged for the transfer of Muthusami Naidu and Kundasami Pillay.

29. The 7th Witness, Muthusami Pillay, a pensioned Clerk was then called, and his evidence (Enclosure 7) was read to him and he accepts it as correct.

30. Says he is a friend of Paraneoosam Naicken, and of Muthusami Naidu and Kundasami Pillay. Paraneoosam Naidu never spoke to him about Muthusami Naicken

or Kundasami Pillay. Did not tell Srinivasa Pillay about the proposed transfers as stated in Srinivasa Pillay's evidence.

31. The 8th Witness, Govindasami Pillay, Draftsman (assistant) in the Division office was then called; his evidence before Mr Horfon was read to him and he accepted it as correct.

32. Lastly, Muthusami Naicken and Kundasami Pillay were examined by Paramcoosam Naidu.

33. Muthusami Naidu said his conversations with Paramcoo: :sam Naidu about collecting money for him took place when nobody was present.

34. Did not understand in what way he was to make collections from the Contractors; the Contractors receive cheques sometimes from him, sometimes from the Division Officer.

35. Never receives fees when he hands over cheques to Contractors.

36. Says Paramcoosam Naicken asked him for fees on the ground that otherwise he would do him some harm.

37. That at the time of sending in the annual report on the Accountants, Para: :ramcoosam Naicken told him that the Supt Engineer asked whether he (Paramcoo: :sam Naidu) was satisfied with Muthusami Naidu and that Paramcoosam Naidu said he was satisfied.

38. He would not have made a written charge but that he was afraid of misrepresentations being made against him. Admits that Paramcoosam Naidu by his representations can do nothing; but he represents him: :self as being able to do so.

39. Kundasami Pillay, the Head Clerk of the Division Office was then called:—

40. States that there were no persons present when Paramcoosam Naidu asked him to collect money

41. Does not know how Paramasivan Kaidu expected him to collect money. Does not make payments to Contractors, and never delivers cheques to Contractors.

42. But for the danger of misrepresentation would not have made written charges.-

43. His brotherinlaw is not a Contractor directly or indirectly. His wife's sister's husband is not a Maistry in the Division; but one of his relatives is a Maistry.-

---

List of documents connected with the case.

1. Mr. Norfor's letter.
2. Letter containing the charge.
3. Deposition of Arumachellam Pillay.
4. ——— Do. ——— of Ayasami Pillay.
5. ——— Do. ——— of Krishnasami Pillay.
6. ——— Do. ——— of Annasami Pillay.
7. ——— Do. ——— of Muthusami Pillay.
8. ——— Do. ——— of Govindasami Pillay.
9. Mr. Norfor's 2d letter.

L. Beatty - Lieut. Col. R.E.
28th April 1881. Supg. Engineer 3d Circle

---

to ruin him; Srinivasa Pillay says he did not.

15. Cross examined by Kunda-samy Pillay.

16. Says he heard nothing about the percentage. But he heard from Annasami Pillay that Paramasivan Kaidu had arranged for the transfer of Accountant Muthusami Naicker, also for Kundasamy Pillay's transfer on reduced pay; and that orders would be passed in a week. Annasami Pillay also said that Paramasivan Naicker got Kundasamy Pillay employed in the Superintending Engineer's Office Madura, and promoted to his present post, and that notwithstanding this he had shown himself ungrateful. The same circumstances were told him by Muthusami Pillay a pensioned Clerk.

17. Srinivasa Pillay does not know the cause of ill-feeling between Paramasivan Kaidu and

41. Does not know how Paramasiva Pillay expected him to collect money. Does not make payments to contractors, and never delivers cheques to contractors.

42. But for the danger of misrepresentation would not have made written charges.-

43. His brotherinlaw is not a contractor directly or indirectly. His wife's sister's husband is not a Maistry in the Division; but one of his relatives is a Maistry.-

---

List of documents connected with the case.

1. Mr. Norfor's letter.
2. Letter containing the charge.
3. Deposition of Arumachellam Pillay.
4. ___ Do. ___ of Ayasami Pillay.
5. ___ Do. ___ of Krishnasami Pillay.
6. ___ Do. ___ of Annasami Pillay.
7. ___ Do. ___ of Muthusami Pillay.
8. ___ Do. ___ of Govindasami Pillay.
9. Mr. Norfor's 2d letter.

L. Beatty - Lieut. & Sup. R.E.
28th April 1881. Supg. Engineer 3d Circle

---

to ruin him; Srinivasa Pillay says he did not.

15. Cross examined by Kunda-samy Pillay.

16. Says he heard nothing about the percentage. But he heard from Annasami Pillay that Paramasiva Naidu had arranged for the transfer of Arumachellam Muthusami Pillay's son, also for Kundasamy Pillay's transfer on reduced pay; and that orders would be passed in a week. Annasami Pillay also said that Paramasiva Naidu got Kundasamy Pillay employed in the Superintending Engineer's Office Madura, and promoted to his present post, and that notwithstanding this he had shown himself ungrateful. The same circumstances were told him by Muthusami Pillay a pensioned Clerk.

17. Srinivasa Pillay does not know the cause of ill-feeling between Paramasiva Naidu and

Proceedings of an enquiry held at Trichinopoly, on the 7th April 181, into a charge made by Head Clerk Kundasamy Pillay and accountant Muthusami Naion, against Head Clerk Paramcoosam Naion.

The charge is contained in a letter dated 10th March 181, addressed to the Executive Engineer, Trichinopoly, and runs as follows:—

2. "On several occasions the Head Clerk" (meaning Paramcoosam Naidu the Head Clerk of the Superintending Engineer's Office) "requested us to collect and give him 3 per cent on payments made to Contractors employed in this Division."

3. The letter in question was forwarded to the Superintending Engineer, by the Executive Engineer Mr. B. H. J. Norfon, who stated that he believed in the truth of the charge.

4. It became therefore necessary for the Superintending Engineer to hold an enquiry into the case under para 9 & 8 of the P. W. Code.

5.

Enclosure 9.

№ 4316. 28th March 181.

From.

The Offg Execr Engineer
In ch: of Trichinopoly Dr

To,

The Supg Engineer 3d Divn
Trichinopoly.

Sir,

Enclos: 4.

With reference to your letter № 1692 T.C dated 25th Inst,

1. Deposition taken from Draftsman Govindasamy Pillay.	I have the honor to forward herewith the enclosed four depositions taken from the individuals noted in the margin.
2. —Dº— —Dº— 2d Clerk Krishnasamy Pillay.	
3. —Dº— Dº— late agt Subordinate annasamy Pillay	
4. —Dº— Dº— Pensioned Clerk. Muthusamy Pillay.	

Please take the deposition of your Clerk Sreenivasa Pillay

I have &c-

[sd] C. Morfor.
Offg Execr Engineer
In ch: of Trichy Dr-

K.C.D.

Deposition of Gurudasamy Pillay

2nd Draftsman S.S

I heard from Muthusamy Pillay that the Supt Engineer's Office Head Clerk was telling to him that he had given sufficient urgings to Gurudasamy Pillay, Head Clerk of the Divisional Office and he has spoken to the gentleman about him and he has also consented to transfer him on reduced pay very soon. He informed that he has also made a report to the Govt about Muthusamy Pillay to be transferred and that will take effect very soon.

[sd] Gurudasamy Pillay

14/3/81.

E.B.

Deposition of Muthusamy Pillay

Pendicud Clerk -

About 10 days ago, annasamy
acting Subovrseer
Pillay, Govindasamy Pillay, 2nd Draftsman S.E. Div Rail
Sreenivasa Pillay and Krishna
samy 3rd Clerk S.E. Pillay came to my
house to go to a festival. I
did not mention of Kandasamy
Head Clerk
S.E. Pillay's name or the Supt
Paramcoosam Engineer's manager's name
in connection with any matters.
They used to be great friends,
but I do not know if they
are so now. I did not mention
the Division Head accountant's
Muthusamichetty name to any body that day.
I am a friend of Paramcoosam
Head clerk
S.E. Pillay -

f.s/ A. Muthusamy

L.I.D.

Pensioned Clerk -

About 10 days ago, annasamy
acting Subordinate
Pillay, Govindasamy Pillay, 2nd Draftsman S. & Bs Rly
Sreenivasa Pillay and Krishna
samy 3rd Clerk S. & B. Pillay, came to my
house to go to a festival. I
did not mention of Kandasamy
Head Clerk
S. B. Pillay's name or the Supt
Paramcoosam Engineer's manager's name
in connection with any matters.
They used to be great friends,
but I do not know if they
are so now. I did not mention
Chathiramin Chetty the Division Head accountant's
name to any body that day.
I am a friend of Paramcoosam
Head Clerk
S. B

sd/ A. Muthusamy

L. D. -

Deposition of Head Clerk Pillay

About 10 days ago, annasamy Pillay, Govindasamy Pillay & Streenivasa Pillay and Krishna samy Pillay, came to my house to go to a festival. I did not mention of Govindasamy Pillay's name or the Supg Engineer's Manager's name in connection with any matters. They used to be great friends, but I do not know if they are so now. I did not mention the Division Head accountant's name to any body that day. I am a friend of Parancushanaiyan.

s/d A. Muthusamy

H.C.

To

The Chief Engineer

Public Works Department

Madras.

The humble Appeal of Mr. Arunachella Pillay 3rd Grade Suboverseer Trichinopoly Division against the decision of the Superintg. Engineer 3rd Circle Trichinopoly.

Most Honored Sir.

1. With profound respect & humble submission I most respectfully beg to lay before your honors generosity my grievances with my humble prayers that Justice may be rendered I, the most helpless and unfortunate creature may thus be protected.

2. I am a Government servant of 18 years standing in the Department, and during the above period I have behaved myself to the entire satisfaction of my superiors under whom I was put to serve on different occasions. My service register recorded in the Trichinopoly Division office will bear out my statement.

3. I am sorry to apprize your Majesty that I was unfortunately & unjustly dismissed by the Supg. Engineer Trichinopoly under the plea that I have committed the guilty of malicious conspiracy to ruin the Head Clerk Parangoosam Naidoo.

4. I most respectfully beg to submit that on the day of enquiry of the Complaint brought against Parangoosam Naidoo Head Clerk of the Supg. Engineers office by the Head Clerk and Accountant of the Executive Engineers office

was examined as a witness in support of the charge thereof. The statement given by me is a fact in what had really and actually told by dismissed clerk Parangoosamy Naidoo. For telling the truth but nothing but the truth of what had taken place between my self and Parangoosamy Naidoo I am dismissed from the Government Service.

I therefore most humbly and respectfully solicit your honor's generosity will kindly take my deplorable circumstances into your honor's merciful Consideration and protect me and my poor large family ordering my restoration to my appointment after perusing the statement herein enclosed for your honor's valuable information.

For this act of Charity and benevolence I shall as in duty bound will ever pray.

I have the honor to remain
Most Honored Sir
Your Honor's most Obt Servt
Antrobus Mackellar
Late 3rd Cl. Interpreter &
Eriehmopoly Division

14th May 1881
Eriehmopoly

P. W. C. No. 2998

Rec. 18th inst.

Encl: 1.

From

G. M. Arumachellum Esq
Late 3rd Gr. Sub Overseer
Trichinopoly Divn
3rd Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. Department
Madras

Encl: 1.

Ch. No. 1249 dy 18 May/81.

To the Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle for report

R. H. Sankey
Col.

16 May/81

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE, 3RD CIRCLE,

Trichinopoly 24/5/1881.

No. 270 T.C. Desp: 25th

From, Lieut. Col. J. Beatty R.E.

Superintending Engineer, 3rd Circle,

To,

Col. R. H. Sankey R.E.
Chief Engineer P. W.D.

Sir,

With reference to your Endorsement No. 1249 of 18th Inst. on 3rd Grade Sub Overseer Arumachellam Pillay's petition, herewith returned, I have the honor to refer you to my letter No. 211 T.C of 16th Instant, with which the full particulars of the case in question have been given.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obdt. servt

J. Beatty Lieut. Col. R.E.
Supg. Engineer 3rd Circle

P. W. C. No. 316

P. W. D. 3RD CIRCLE.

From

The Superintending Engineer,

3rd Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 270 T.C

Dated 24th } May 1881
Received 27th }

Enclosures. X.2

Sub overseer Arm:
: nachellam Pillay

Returns petition
of — and states
that the full par:
: ticulars of the
case are given in
the letter of the
16th Instant —

Papers P 30/5
1 pt up

O. 28-5-81
A 1013

No 455

Executive Engineer's Office
Trichinopoly 14th May 1881.

From
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

To The Chief Engineer
Public Works Departt.
Madras

Sir

With reference to G C
No 1072 W of 25th April 1881 I have the honor
to request that, as no opportu:
-nity was afforded to me to
offer, an explanation on the
Superintending Engineer's letter
No. 28 Tc of 8th April 1881 to your addres
(which letter I have not as yet
seen) I beg you will not relieve
me of Charge of this Division
until my explanation has been
obtained & disposed of — Any
instructions have already been
issued for my relief kindly
interfere by Telegram

2. The matter being
extremely urgent, I send this
direct, for which I beg to be
excused —

3. A copy of this letter

From
The Offg Exec Engr.
Irrichniopoly Dn

To
The Chief Engr.
P. W. D.

Dated 14th
Recd } May 1881

No. 455

Memo No. 141 d/ 7th June 1881

Requests not to relieve him of the Irrichniopoly Division till his explanation on G C No. 1072 dd 25th April 1881 is obtained and disposed of.

16-5-81 7/6/81

To,

C. H. J. Norfon Esquire
Offg Execn Engineer
Irrichniopoly Division.

Most Honored Sir,

We the undersigned most respectfully beg to bring the following to your notice on the conduct of the Head Clerk of the Paramcoolem Supr Engineer's Office and to request that the same may be submitted to the Supr Engineer for his regular enquiry and final disposal.

2. On several occasions the Head Paramcoolem Clerk requested us to collect and give him 3 per cent on payments made to Contractors employed in this Division. (This we brought to your notice sometime in December last). This sort of dealing being quite against our conscience we informed him repeatedly that we will never interfere in the matter

P.W. Chs. 3006

I

File submitted.
Appeal from Mr. Hosp
not yet heard disposed

K.R. 3/6

P.L. 25/5

C.A.W.

2d- we have
the file connected
with the charges
preferred against
Colonel Bentley's
Manager &...

B.H.H.

30/6/87

W.

Submitted.

R.S.

30/6

Mems No 120 of 30th May 1887

C.W. 2998/315

Petition from C.M. Arunachellum Pillay, late 3d Gr. Sub Overseer, Tjeluy Dn of 14th May 1887 appealing agt the decision of the Supg Engr 3d Cir: in his dismissal.

The Chief Engineer has, on a careful review of the whole case, declined to interfere with the decision of the Supg. Engineer.

(Sd.) R.A. Sankey. Col. RE
Chief Engr

(Init.) R.S.
C.A.W.
Desp'd 30/6-

To, C.M. Arunachellum pillay
late 3d Gr. Sub Overseer
Tjeluy Dn

P.L. 25/6-

and that if he wishes he may collect the required percentage himself from the Contractors. On this the Head Clerk sent word Parameswaran to us through Contractor Iyasamy Pillay and Sub overseer Arunachellam Pillay on two different occasions in the month of January last that if we do not yield to his request we will have to undergo his displeasure. The above said Contractor Iyasamy and the Sub Overseer Arunachellam may be questioned on the point and their evidence taken in writing in your honor's presence and sent on to the Supt. Engineer with this petition.

3. The second and third Clerks Thirunavukarasu of the Supt. Engineer's Office are also well aware of the cause of ill feelings between ourselves and the Head Clerk and we believe that they will not hide what they really know if they are asked to state the facts on oath.

4. The Head Clerk a week or 10 days ago was telling to one Pensioned Clerk, Muthusamy Pillay who is living at Puthur that as we have failed to comply with his request, he had suggested to the Supt. Engineer regarding our transfers and that the result will be known very soon. Muthu: samy Pillay told this to the individuals marginally noted. If all these persons were questioned this point will be proved.

5. From the above circumstances we form an idea that the Head Clerk is very much ill disposed towards us and this is the cause of several unbearable warnings and threats which we were lately obliged to receive from the Supt. Engineer who, it is believed, should have been misrepresented by his head Clerk. It will be observed from our Service Registers that we never had occasion to such warnings during the whole

⊗ (1) Govindasamy Pillay, 2nd Draftsman Dr. Office.
(2) Sreenivasan Pillay, 3rd Clerk Supt. Engrs Office.
(3) Krishnasamy Pillay, 2nd Clerk in the Dr. Office.
(4) Annasamy Pillay, Asst. Sub Overseer, 3rd Grade.

period of our service in the De:
:partment.

6. Although it is not our desire to bring complaint against the Head Clerk yet we do so because we are afraid that by the Head Clerks constant misrepresentations to the Superintending Engineer, we will have some day or other entangled in danger of ruin -

We beg &c.

[sd] G. Swoothoosamy Naicken
Accountant. Trichy Dr's office.
10/3/81.

[sd] K. Muthasamy
Hd Clerk. Trichy Dr's Office.

[Inof] b. h
11.3.81.

Sivaloganathan

Subordinates -

About 2 months ago as I was going to the Divisional Stores to get a Levelling Instrument for levelling in the Kallaithigalum Tank the Supt Engr's Head Clerk Paramasivam was walking in the Verandah near the Office, he saw me and called me and conversed with me about his sisters marriage and the extra expenses that had occurred during the marriage. He also told me that he has requested the Head Clerk and Accountant of the Division Office to collect a percentage for him. He told me that it is he that had recommended Kundasamy for the Head Clerk's Post in this Division and that it was through his influence that Kundasamy Naicken was transferred from the Examiner's Office

to this office. I did this, he said thinking that they would be of great assistance to me, but now they are not so, he requested me to advise them not to gain his displeasure. I said very well I will inform them and accordingly I did so.

Sd/ B. Mr. Arumachellam
3rd Grade, Sub overseer.

15/3/81.

Sd/ B.R. £12.

I am a Contractor in this Dist and my name is Iyasamy Pilly

Paracoexam The Supg Engineer's Manager called me about 2 months ago, during Pongal and asked me

Enquiry if I gave the overseer or the Division Office people any percentage on the contracts that I get. I replied that I gave nothing. To which the

Paracoexam Head Clerk said, Ah all the contractors say the same, but I believe that the Dn Office people get some thing from you all. please go & inform the Division office Head Clerk

Cundaswamy that I have already spoken in the matter to him and I have also sent word through some other individuals and if he does not yield to my request and give a percentage he will get my displeasure. He also in=

formed me that he gets per-
centage regularly from the
other 4 Divisions. He told me
I must bring him an answer
soon. I immediately informed
the Division Head Clerk, who
told me that he would not
interfere in the matter. I
did not go again to the Supg
Engr's Head Clerk. I informed
this to the Division Head as:
constant also.

p/ G. Iyasamy Pillay

p/ b.h

14.3.87.

Exhibit 5.

2nd Clerk E&S office.

I went to Muthusamy Pillay
house about 10 days before,
when I saw Muthusamy conv
versing with Seenevasa Pillay
and annasamy Pillay, and
heard him tell them that
Seenevasa Pillay, Arudasamy
Pillay and Subramonia Pillay
are great friends. and this is
the cause which gives vexation
to the Head Clerk of the Supg
Engineer's Office. I left the
house while the other two indivi=
duals were conversing.

p/ Krishnasamy

2nd Clerk. Dy Office. Trichy

14/3/87.

Deposition of Annasamy Pillay
acting Sub Overseer

I did not hear Pensioned
Clerk Muthusamy Pillay tell
anybody that the Head Clerk
Parameswaran
of the Supt Engineer's office
told him that the Divisional
Head Muthusamikandu accountant and Head
Clerk Cundasamy not having complied
with his request about getting
3 per cent on all Estimates, he
was going to recommend their
transfer to the Supt Engineer.
But I heard him say that Narasimulu Naicken was going
to be re-entertained in the Dept
in the new organization. I heard
this about a week or ten days
ago. Muthusamy Pillay con-
Pensioned clerk
versed with Sreenivasa Pillai
S.W. Clerk S.E.
do inside his (Muthusamy's) house
I was outside on the hyal. I
dont know what they were
talking about.

L.D.

[sd] Annasamy Pillay
26|3|87.

Para [illegible]

Yo [illegible] de [illegible]
de [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[

W.8-EW Encl 6

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer D.W.D with the remark that Mr Ch.T. Norton's conduct is considered to be unreasonable. The orders given by the Superintending Engineer were in themselves quite proper and Section 315 of the Code is no way embarrasses Mr Norton's proceedings

Lt Col Chamberlain Corps
Chief Engineer 5th Div

31/3/81

No 881 d/ 2nd April/81
To The S.E. III Circle thro' E.E. 1st D.

Sir

With reference to your letter No 1697. T.C. d/ 25 March/81, I have the honor to remark that it is clear that Mr Norton has misunderstood the Code ruling Para 315 or Colonel Beatty's order was Specific and the duty of yielding implicit obedience to Such is distinctly enjoined therein. Even in the absence of any Such instruction in the Code the impropriety of setting aside the order of the Superintending ought to have been sufficiently clear to Mr Norton, and I trust he will take the distinct

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE, 3RD CIRCLE,

Trichinopoly 25/3/1881.

No. 1697 T.C.

Irrigation

From,

Lieut: Col: J. Beatty R.E.

Superintending Engineer, 3rd Circle,

To,

Colonel R. H. Lankey C.B. R.E.

Chief Engineer P.W.D.

thro: the Chief Engineer for Irrign

Sir,

I have the honor to request you will be good enough to instruct the Executive Engineer Trichinopoly to carry out my instructions in regard to the works referred to in his letter No 1245 of 20 March 1881.

2. Mr Norfor has taken advantage of a certain para of the Public works Code to refuse compliance with what I consider a reasonable request. There was no question of "putting all minor works into working order

Encls: 6.

1. Coll's No 748/10.3.81 with 3 Enclosures (To be obligingly returned).
2. Copy of letter to Exec: Engr: No 1635 T.C./15.3.81.
3. Copy of Exec: Engr's No 1245/20.3.81.

I kindly address the Chief Engineer as to the necessity of having our works in good order, in the Mean while I shall cause a search to be made amongst the records of my Office regarding the new Channel said to have been cut without reference to the Revenue Department, as it seems hardly likely that this Dept: could have done so, without a requisition from either the Rys: or Revenue Officials.

I have &c

(Sd) C.H.I. Norfor

Offg Exe: Engineer

Trichinopoly Dt

(True Copy)

J. Beatty Lt Col RE

Supg Engineer 3rd Circle

BR

CHIEF ENGINEER 28 MAR 1881 FOR IRRIGATION

R III 107 C. 6

Pr 2091 1-1

CHIEF ENGINEER
28 MAR
1881
FOR INFORMATION

R 10.2

5

Nr 2091/81
2

No. 4245. 20th March 1881

From.

The Offg. Exe: Engineer
In charge of Ekkivinpoly Divn.

To,

The Supg Engineer
3d Circle

Sir,

In reference to your Memo No. 1635 - I.C dated 15th Instant, I regret to state that by the authority conveyed in Section 315 of the P.W. Code, I must defer compliance until the matter is decided by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation. His instructions conveyed in Memo No. III/2 Ire of 25th January 81 are clear and absolute and contain no reservations of any kind.

If we have to put all Minor works into working order before handing them over to the Revenue Dept. it will take years before they are off our hands.

Kindly

* (The four Enclosures received are returned)

No. 1635-IC.

Supg Engrs Office 3d Circle
Camp Periyakulam
15th March 81

From

The Supg Engineer
3d Circle

To,

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

Sir,

With reference to the accompanying correspondence, I have the honor to request you will be good enough to estimate for the work proposed by the Assistant Collector, viz, reopening the old Kowakudi Channel as it seems to me that in such a case this Department is bound before handing Channels over to the care of the Revenue Department to do what may be needed to put them in a working condition.

I have &c

(Sd) J. Beatty Lt Col RE
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

J. Beatty. Lt Col RE
Supg Engineer 3d Circle

(True Copy)

Letter 4

1- Collrs No 748 to the 10-3-81 Supg Engrs
1- Asst Collrs No 172 4-3-81
1- Do No 104 11-2-81 to the Exe-Engr
1- Exe-Engrs No 3803 14-2-81 to the Asst Collector.
4 To be returned.

arrangement must be made at once and some kind of a staff supplied for the works which they have given up. I have already written on the subject in my report on the Scheme for handing over works to Revd. Department (vide my letter No 340 of 2d July 1880)

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

J. H. Smith
Assistant Collector.

Plan & estimate for opening out the old Kowakudi Channel

Submitted by Supg Engr
7.3.81.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION 28 MAR 1881

R III 10 I.C. 4

Br 2691/81 3

188 .

From Asst Collector
The ~~Collector~~
Trichinopoly.

To

The Collector
Trichinopoly

Date. 5th
Despd.
Recd. } March 1881.

No. 172
Enclosures 2

Forwards for orders Copies of correspondence & estimate for opening out the Kowakudi Channel & the Executive Engineer's note & Co. of certain work &c.

H. H. Smith
Asst Collector
6.3.81.

TRICHINOPOLY, COLLECTOR'S OFFICE,

10th March 1881.

No. 748

From

The Collector

of Trichinopoly.

To

The Superintending Engineer

Trichinopoly.

SIR,

I am forwarding in original (to be returned) letter No 172 dated 5th March 1881 & its enclosures from the Assistant Collector, I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to cause the works therein referred to to be carried out.

2. I would point out that the abandonment of an existing branch Channel and opening a new one from the Sengani Channel alluded to in the Assistant Collector's letter No 104 dated 11th February 1881 to the Executive Engineer were carried out by your Department without reference to the Revenue Department. It therefore seems to me that the defects in the new Channel complained of should also be remedied by your Department.

I have the honor to be,

Your most obedient servant,

H. G. Jocelyn

for Collector.

CHIEF ENGINEER
28 MAR
FOR IRRIGATION

R III
10 J.C
1

Pr 2091 81

188 /.

From

The Collector

Trichinopoly.

To

The Asst. Collector
Kulitalai

Date. 10 March 1881.
Despd.
Recd.

No. 782

Enclosures 3

Respecting
Cessation
of
irrigation
from Pungani
channel
Works &c
Cassersond.

Assistant Collector's office
Trichinopoly. 11th February 1881

No 104.

From

The Assistant Collector
Trichinopoly

To.

The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Dn.

Sir,

I have the honor to call your attention to certain defects in the irrigation under the Pongani from the branch channels in the limits of Kothamangalam & to request that measures may be taken to remove them.

2. The facts of the cases are as follows.

There were originally 3 branches in Pungani in the limits of Kothamangalam, the first or the Southern branch for the irrigation of the villages on the Mettupatti side, the 2nd or the Northern branch for the villages in the Kullitandi side, & the 3d or the middle branch for Thinniyam village. In 1877 the 2nd branch was abandoned and the 3d was widened as far as the limits of Sirumayadi village, where a regulating dam was constructed and a new branch from the Dam was formed, for the irrigation of Konatandi, Sembari, Mullal, Kullitandi Alimpudi and Pottai villages, which were

before irrigated by the abandoned branch. As this new branch was dug rather deeper than the old branch, there has been ever since then a difficulty in getting water for Komobudi, Lembari, and Mullai villages whose fields are on a higher level.

3. The changes appear to have been made by the D.P.W, but why and under what circumstances I have no means of discovering.

4. This difficulty was brought to the notice of the Sub: Engineer to whose range these villages belonged by the Tahsildar of Tiruchirapoly in his Yadast No 176 of 14 July 1877. To this he received a reply in Yadast No 131 of 17 Idem, that "a Memo was sent to the Overseer to prepare Estimates". The Tahsildar again sent reminders in the Yadasts noted in the margin. To these no replies were received.

No 830 of 12 March 78.
No 570 of 13 Mar 79.

5. As nothing has been done to remedy the defects and as the villages suffered much from want of water to their fields, the Tahsildar made a temporary arrangement to take water to the fields of the above said 3 villages by throwing temporary bunds across the channel.

6. This practice of course gave rise to complaints from the villagers lower down, who found this water supply obstructed & diminished by the use of these bunds.

There have been constant water disputes over the matter & one of these coming before me for disposal last year. I personally inspected the spot. I found that from the fact of the fields of the Komabudi village being higher than the bed of the channel, it would obtain no water supply at all unless some sort of bunds across the channel was allowed.

It is impossible therefore to prohibit the erection of bunds under the present system - & so long as they are allowed there are certain to be constant disputes over the water supply between the different villagers. To prevent disputes at present as a temporary measure I made an arrangement, agreed to by all the villagers under the branch channel, by which a certain time for blocking the channel by the people of each village was fixed and at the same time promised to remedy the defects in the ensuing hot season if possible.

What the villagers require and

what I myself think will be the best course is to reopen the old Komakudi channel from above the new Regulating dams for Komagudi &c. If this is done from a place where there is proper level for irrigating the fields of the Komakudi village there will be no need for blocking the branch channel as was hitherto done. There will then be sufficient water for the fields of the other villages and there will be an end to all the existing disputes.

If you agree with me in thinking this the best remedy for the existing difficulty I think the cost of restoring the old channel should be borne by Government & the work completed by the D.P.W. If you think that this cannot be done at once ie in the ensuing dry season, or if there is any reason why it should not be done at the cost of Govt, the ryots will I am sure be willing to undertake the completion of the work themselves at their own cost provided the place is marked out by the D.P.W.

It is also reported to me by the

Br 2091/81
6

Tahsildar that the Kalvoikal (the middle branch) and the Nethupatti branch run parallel & very close to each other & that in the limits Sirumayangudi the bund between them is very thin, and that the Nethupatti villagers take advantage of this & very often cut through the bund in order to let more water into their channel. I request that this place may be ordered to be inspected and the bund strengthened as you may think proper & made safe.

The matter which is one of some importance has been pending in the hands of the officers of your Department for the last 3½ years. There are constant disputes and quarrels for water amongst the ryots. The arrangement that I have made can only be a temporary one & was agreed to by the ryots on the understanding that a permanent remedy should be given as soon as possible. I therefore request that you will be good enough to give early attention to this subject and inform me what you

propose to do at your earliest convenience.

I have &c.

Signed/ H. L. Joseph.

Act. Collector.

AC

(Free copy)

CHIEF ENGINEER 20 MAR 1881 FOR IRRIGATION

R III W.J.C. 2

H. L. Joseph

Act. Collector

Br 2091/F1 5-

CHIEF ENGINEER 28 MAR 1881 FOR IRRIGATION

R III W.J.C. 3

188

Trichinopoly Office

From

The Offg. Executive Engr Incharge of Trichinopoly

To

The Assistant Collector Trichinopoly

Dated. 14th
Despd. 15th } Feby 1881
Recd.

No. 3803

Enclosure.

Former Reference.

Sir.

I acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 104 of the 11 Instant I have the honor to inform you that I have received an order from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation that

4/2093/81

Trichinopoly, Collector's Office,

188 .

No.

From

The ~~Collector~~ Assistant Collector of Trichinopoly.

To

The Collector of Trichinopoly

Sir,

I have the honor to forward herewith Copies of my letter No 104 of 11th Instant to the Executive Engineer and his reply to it No 3803 of 14th idem and to request that you will be good enough to inform me by whom the works such as are therein referred to should be done for the future.

2. The change referred to in my letter appears to have been made by the D. P. W. and shortly after this the defects noticed were brought to their notice but they have so far done nothing to remedy and the Ex Engineer now declines to take any steps in the matter at all.

If an order has been received that the D. P. W are to attend only to Imperial Works same distinct

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION 28 MAR 1881

188 .

From Asstt Collector

The ~~Collector~~

Trichinopoly.

To

The Collector

Trichinopoly

Date. 5th
Despd. } March 1881.
Recd.

No. 172
Enclosures 2

Forwards for orders copies of correspondence between himself and the Executive Engineer with regard to the execution of certain works.

Asst. Collector
6.3.81.

arrangement prevent the made at once and Same kind of Cafs supplied for the works which they have given up & have already written on the subject in my report on the Khan Bahadur's scheme.

Copy herewith (this by letter No 340 of 2nd July 1880)

Mr 209/81

3

I have the honor to be Sir Your most obedient Servant

Sir Joseph Arbuthnot Collector.

Submitted Supt Engr.

7.3.81.

Please receive & return with the enclosures