

27-1-53
30-1

30-1-01

The Suptg Engr will
arrange for such re-employment
on the ~~first opportunity~~
occurrence of a suitable
vacancy.

W.
22.10.84

Source

No. 25497. 28. 10. 84

W.
20.10

To,

28/10

The Petitioner of
S.E. VI Circle.

Wm

B
from orders

No 2649/84

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

28th 11/84

Read the following

Petition from S. Kastnaswami Esq,
late Suptt of Upper Arcot, Tanjore Dist. } H.E. dated Sept^r 18th 1884
Letter from the S.E. VI Circle — (No 1044 J of Oct^r 9th 1884)

On review of the
petitioner's case as presented
in the papers laid before
Government, and taking
into account his previous
service, H.E. the Governor
in Council sees no objection
to the petitioner's re-employ-
ment in a permanent
capacity, in his former
grade.

The Hon. P. C. S. S. S. S.

(8)



Disposal should be
in terms of M. J. S. S. S. S.

Superseded
S. S. S. S. S.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the following

Appeal from S. Kristnasamy
Iyer, late Supt. of Upper District
in the Tanjore Division — } H.E. No. — of 18th September/84
Letter from the Supg. Engr. }
VI Circle — } N. 1044 J. of 9th Oct/84.

Petitioner is
informed that the
Government decline
to interfere in his case.

I must confess that
I don't think this case
against him is a very
strong one. Had he
deliberately made nothing
to could have been raised
I have produced
petitioners & as he did not
do this I am inclined
to believe his statement
is true. He is an old
Supg. Engr. VI Circle.
The petitioner
grade.

Cy.

15.10.84

W
15.10.84

No 1720 D. of 24-9-84

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

P.W.D. No 482

From

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 1044 T. J.

Dated 9th } Oct 2/1884
Received //

Enclosure. 1. 4

S. Kristnasamy Iyer
late Superintendent

Report on the
petition of —

service into consideration, it was not possible to re-employ him in any capacity. They replied that they had no objection to employ him as a temporary draftsman, the Executive Engineer added that he could not advise his restoration to the position of Superintendent. On the receipt of this I was in charge of the Circle, and I sent Krishna Rao, Esq. an endorsement that I declined to reopen the case which had been decided after careful enquiry. The man has been in temporary employ for some time in the Cannery & Vernacular Regulator Division, but has, I am informed, left them. I am not aware of the reason.

3. Under the circumstances I do not consider it is necessary for me to comment on the case or to forward for perusal the papers. I therefore return the petition.

I have the honor to be

Sir
Your most obedient servant
M. M. Luit Col. R. S.

Subjunctive in Revenue & Circle.

Trichinopoly 9th October 1884

No. 1044 T, J

From

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The

Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Madras.

Sir,

ENCLOSURE 1.

Returned
x in August 82

With reference to your endorsement No. 1720 D of 24th September 1884, I have the honor to report that S. Krishnasamy Iyer was dismissed by Colonel Beatty then Superintending Engineer of this Circle after careful enquiry.

The papers, reports, depositions, &c., are in this office, I have read them over, and I agree with Col. Beatty that the man was guilty of fraud.

2 In September 1882 Krishnasamy Iyer again addressed Col. Beatty, and requested him to reconsider his decision. Col. Beatty forwarded this to the Tanjore Executive Engineer and the Sub-Officer for their opinion whether, taking Krishnasamy Iyer's long

servi



Recd 20/9/84
24

Chipath
24th Sept/84

No. 1720 D

Referred to the
Suply Engr VI Circle
for report
(By order)

C. Unwin. Major R.E.
under Secy to Govt P.W.D.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

6TH CIRCLE.

Trichinopoly 9th October 1884

No. 1044 T, J

From

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The

Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Madras.

Sir,

ENCLOSURE 1.

Returned
in August 1882

With reference to your endorsement No. 1720 D of 24th September 1884, I have the honor to report that S. Krishnasamy Iyer was dismissed by Colonel Beatty then Superintending Engineer of this Circle after careful enquiry.

The papers, reports, depositions, &c., are in this office, I have read them over, and I agree with Col. Beatty that the man was guilty of fraud.

2 In September 1882 Krishnasamy Iyer again addressed Col. Beatty, and requested him to reconsider his decision. Col. Beatty forwarded this to the Tanjore Executive Engineer and the Sub-Officer for their opinion whether, taking Krishnasamy Iyer's lang

To

His Excellency the Governor in Council,
Fort Saint George.Through the Chief Engineer, P. W. D.,
Madras.THE HUMBLE APPEAL OF S. KRISHNASAMY IYER, LATE
SUPERINTENDENT OF UPPER ANICUT IN THE
TANJORE DIVISION.

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY.

With due respect and humble submission, the petitioner most respectfully begs to lay before your Excellency his Appeal against the decision of the Superintending Engineer Sixth Circle, and prays your Excellency to call for the records (especially the Review Petition and the Superintending Engineer's Endorsement thereon and the letters from the Divisional and Sub-Divisional officers Tanjore expressing their opinion as to the petitioner's re-entertainment) of the case and condescend to peruse them and grant the poor petitioner the redress he earnestly seeks.

That, in May 1882, when the petitioner was Superintendent of Upper Anicut, he was ordered by Serjeant A. Temple, Supervisor, to purchase some sundry articles such as nails and ropes for the anicut works.

Your Excellency's poor petitioner begs to bring to notice that no Government money was advanced for the purchase, but on the contrary, the petitioner had to purchase the things at his own cost and obtain money from the Supervisor, after the things were approved of and passed by that officer.

Your Excellency's humblest petitioner borrowed some money from the Supervisor himself (which was returned the next day) and effected the purchase of some nails, through one of the anicut lascars, for Rs. 1-10-0 and again some more nails and ropes for Rs. 9-6-0, through another lascar, named Ponnusami, who was much liked by the Supervisor, in all for Rs. 11 only—a very small sum. The petitioner entered their price, as stated by the lascar, in a piece of paper, and placed the things before the Supervisor for his approval. The Supervisor weighed one of the nails with a small scale he had for his domestic use and said that the nails and ropes were overcharged to the extent of Rs. 3-6-0, which the petitioner had no means of knowing, for, neither was he provided with a scale, nor was there any bazaar near to enable him to verify the lascar's statement, and, besides, he did not expect that a lascar equally a Government servant like himself would abuse the trust reposed in him. The petitioner called on the lascar Ponnusami who effected the purchase for a pretty large amount (Rs. 9-6-0) to account for the deficiency. The Supervisor himself knew that Ponnusami was sent to purchase the things.

Here is the delicacy in the case which the petitioner craves your Excellency to consider. The lascar, finding himself in a dilemma, accounted for the deficiency by saying that he was instructed by the Superintendent (petitioner) to say that he paid more than what the things actually cost.

The Supervisor confided in the lascar's statement, got a written plaint from him and without any enquiry reported to the Sub Divisional Officer that the petitioner had tried to deceive him to the extent of Rs. 3-6-0, when, during the course of a year and a half the petitioner was in charge of the Anicut, he has carried out about Rs. 12,000 worth of work, departmentally, to the entire satisfaction of his superior officers.

A momentary consideration will convince any impartial thinker, much more your Excellency, that the opinion formed by the Supervisor, and, at his instance, by the superior officers is highly improbable, for, will it be charitable to conclude that the petitioner holding a responsible appointment, and drawing a pensionable pay, with fair prospects before him, would compromise his own honor and endanger his own situation, by attempting to misappropriate a paltry sum of Rs. 3, and can he be reasonably expected, as the lascar says in his plaint, to have sought him to corroborate his (petitioner's) statement by a falsehood, knowing what the result would be if the lascar had dissembled? Further, will it appear just in the eyes of your Excellency to attach any value to the lascar's statement made after the deficiency was discovered. If the lascar had dealt honestly, and if the allegation that the petitioner instructed him to utter a falsehood were true, he should have brought the matter to the Supervisor's notice before there was any question at all about deficiency.

Your Excellency's humblest petitioner begs to state, that, without considering it probable that a lascar getting Rs. 4 per mensem might have deceived the petitioner as well as Government and, without holding a regular enquiry which the petitioner craved for, Colonel Beatty R. E. the then Superintending Engineer dismissed the petitioner for "lying" and "cheating," as he himself says in his decision "to set an example to others," when, to quote his own words the charge had been only "fairly proved".

After the receipt of the Superintending Engineer's Decision, the petitioner explained the matter, in person to that gentleman, and presented a Review Petition explaining all the points that appeared irreconcilable to that officer. He was convinced that the petitioner was very hardly dealt with, and forwarded the petition for the opinion of the Divisional and Sub-Divisional officers Tanjore, whether, considering the petitioner's long service, he might be re-entertained in any capacity. They were kind enough to report that the petitioner was one of their best Superintendents, and that they had no objection to his re-entertainment in temporary employ. But before their reports were received in the Superintending Engineer's office, the charge of the sixth circle was, unfortunately for the petitioner, transferred to Colonel Mead R. E., and, as a new officer, that gentleman lately declined to interfere in the petitioner's case.

Your Excellency's humblest petitioner respectfully begs to observe that the crimes attributed to him, viz "lying" and "cheating" are so very heinous that he is quite disqualified to lay any claim on Government even for a temporary footing but when the very officers who were concerned in his dismissal have been pleased, after due consideration of the Review petition, to pronounce him guiltless for a temporary appointment, (the responsibilities of a temporary man are by no means less) cannot he be held to be equally guiltless for his former permanent post, or, can it not, at least be reasonably maintained that the officers have considered the punishment inflicted as unmerited;

Your Excellency's petitioner further begs to state that after patiently waiting nearly a year, for a reply to his Review petition which he has not been favoured with, he applied to the Executive Engineer Tanjore, for copies of records, to enable him to draw up his Appeal, and, on being refused, finally petitioned the Superintending Engineer in August 1884 who has declined to interfere.

In conclusion your humblest petitioner most respectfully begs to state that the case has been conducted, from beginning to end, with a prejudiced notion that the Superintendent was responsible for the lascar's deceit and the petitioner's cries for a regular enquiry have been unanimously unheeded.

For which act of kindness, as in duty bound, the petitioner ever prays for your Excellency's long life and prosperity.

Your Excellency's most obedient and humble servant.

S. Sasthianam

Late Superintendent of
Upper Anicut.

ENCLOSURES.

Superintending Engineer's Decision.	1	<i>residing in</i>
Extract from the Review Petition ...	1	
Copies of testimonials	1	

Quistagiripet
Cuddapah

18th September 1884

whi

Wm 1
M. 790
84 82/86
C. 169529



Aug 20/9/86
Sub

Chipall
24th Sept/84

No. 1720D

Referred to the
Suply Engr VI Circle
for report
(By order)

C. Unwin. Major R.E.
under Secy to Govt. P.W.D.

the being his own man
The defendant's side in the
case has not been heard at
all.

I Distressing, from
1 June Extract / Late Sup. of
P. / per audit.

W. 2
M. 790
1/169529/84 82/86



4m 1
 790
 848216
 Clk 16/5/59



Ad 20/9/86
 2-3

Chapall
 24th Sept 84

No 1720 D

Referred to the
 Suply Engr VI Circle
 for report
 (By order)

C. Unwin. Majr R.E.
 under Secy to Govt P.W.D.

Extract from the Review Petition

Superintending Engineer's
 remarks in his decision of
 the case

Petitioner's explanation of the
 Superintending Engineer's doubt

The Superintendent was called
 on to produce the original bazaar
 receipts in support of his state-
 ment which he has never done

This I could not do as
 I was not the purchaser. I
 asked the Lascar whom I sent
 to purchase the materials to
 go and fetch bazaar receipts,
 but he finding that the deceit
 he intended to practise upon
 me was likely to have been
 detected wilfully omitted to
 obey my bidding.

In order to account for not
 having the receipts he first
 stated that he had sent Rs 12
 with Ponnusami and only
 received 11 Rupees worth of
 materials and that consequently
 he had sent the receipts back
 to Trichinopoly by Ponnusami
 to recover the other rupee.

Rs 11 the value of materials
 is made up of Rs 1. 10. . being
 the value of materials (nails)
 purchased by Govinda Pillai
 Lascar and of Rs 9. 6. . of
 materials purchased by
 Ponnusami Lascar. When I
 presented the materials before
 the Extra Officer for inspection
 and it was found that the nails
 weighed less I asked Ponnusami
 to go and fetch Lascar account
 since the extra Officer required it,
 but instead of doing that, he
 continued the expedient of
 presenting a plaint.

Rs 11 the value of materials is charged for in the bill is made up as follows

100 Rope Rollers Rs 3-2--

1 Big rope. Rs " 14--

2 1/2 Seers of nails ^(at 400 per seer) Rs 5-6--

Total purchased by Ponunsami Lascar. Rs 9-6--

6 1/2 Seers of nails

purchased by

Govinda Pillai

Lascar.

Rs. 1-10--

Rs 11-6--

If, as your honor says, I had stated to have sent Rs 12 with Ponunsami I should have had to recover Rs 2-10--, and not Rupee one only. I never told Serjt Temple that I sent Rs 12 with Ponunsami but only Rs 10. He has entirely misunderstood me.

and no doubt he (Krisnasami) would have produced forged receipts if Serjt Temple had been likely to accept them.

If I be allowed the liberty of expressing my opinion, this remark casts an unwarranted aspersion on my Character. It presumes

The Expiration is in my opinion a tissue of lies from beginning to end.

All that can be done is to dismiss the man against whom a charge is fairly proved as in this case.

that producing forged receipts is habitual with me. Will Serjt Temple or Mr. Bird cite one example of the kind at least within the last two years during which I have carried out Rs 12000 worth of work. It is a pity that the nature of the case should have been so misrepresented to your honor as to necessitate your honor to pass such a remark. Neither Serjt Temple nor Mr. Bird were ever pleased to enquire into the matter by examining the respectable men and Lascars whom I have cited as witnesses to the fact that Ponunsami stated to have purchased materials for the value I have charged for.

The important point in the case viz whether I have deceived or have been deceived never struck Mr. Bird (Offg. Executive Engineer). What has happened is this:- Serjt Temple has taken action on the strength of Ponunsami's plaint.

he being his own man
The defendant's side in the
case has not been heard at
all.

J. Rustum, Jr.
True Extract / Late Sup't of
N. P. per account.



it turned out that the weight of the rails
was probably about 19 seers while 28 were
charged in the bill.

The defalcation is in my opinion
a tissue of lies from beginning to end.

These Superintendents have very
many opportunities of helping themselves
at the expense of Govt and it is much to be
feared that a good deal of roquetry goes on.
All that can be done is to dismiss the man
against whom a charge is fairly proved
as in this case.

I conclude therefore that
Kushnaram knew well that vouchers are required
(2) that he did receive vouchers from the larvae
(3) that his two explanations for not producing them
were false and (4) that he did attempt to
cheat Govt probably to the extent of Rs. 3-6-0.

Superintendent Kushnaram is
therefore dismissed for lying & cheating.

Kumbhakam. (Sd) J. Beatty, Col. &
8th August 82. Sup't Engr. B. H. C. C.

(True copy)

J. Rustum, Jr.
Late Sup't of
N. P. per account.



Decision of the Superintending Engineer
in the Case of Krishnasami Sgr, Superintendent
Upper Coleroon Anicut.

The Superintendent is charged with
having, on the 16th May, presented a false statement
to the extra officer Sergeant Temple for the purpose
of cheating Government. He had bought nails and
rope for the Anicut works which are supposed to
have cost Rs 7.10.0. and he presented a written
statement unsupported by vouchers for Rs 11.0.0.

The Superintendent was called on
to produce the original Bazaar receipts in support
of his statement, which he has never done:-

In order to account for not having
the receipts, he first stated that he had sent Rs 12
with Ponnusami and only received 11 Rupees
worth of materials and that consequently he had
sent the receipts back to Trichinopoly by
Ponnusami, in order to recover the other Rupee.

But in his "expurgation of the
charges" he writes that he "gave to Ponnusami
Rs 10" and that the amount was charged
according to "the statement of the lascar who bought
them." Since I usually believe lascars under me.

Krishnasami Sgr is an old servant
of the Department and must have known that
vouchers are required in support of all charges of
any consequence and no doubt he would have
produced forged receipts if Sergeant A. Temple
had been likely to accept them. But the extra
officer doubted the correctness of the weight
as stated by the Superintendent; and on
Inquiry

to his duties which he performed to my satisfaction.
He knows a little English & in other respects
I consider him well qualified for the post
he now holds -

(sd) C. Littlewood
Mammargudi 1845
16th Aug 1884
Supervision & Dis.

In the short period that I was in charge
of the Kumbhakonam Sub. Dist. Krishnasami Sgr
was Superintendent of the Corayar Head Works
and gave satisfaction in the works required
of him - He appears to be a good and
intelligent man.

(sd) J. A. Lox
Corayar Head.
6-7-77.
Sub Engineer

I was sent by
Late Supt of
Office

Copies of testimonials

Krishnasami has served under me as Monegas
of the Jembulawery Head and afterwards as Supto
of the Vettalur Head Works. I have always found him
attentive to his duties & hard working - He can
read & write English & is Capable of Superintending
most river works. Works that have been under
his charge I have generally found well done

Puduchuttram }
 26th June 1874 }

(Sd) L. Greenway
 Assistant Engineer. No. 1 Range.

Kristinas am. Jgr. was only under me for about a month so that I cannot pretend an intimate acquaintance with his work. From the little I saw of him I should say that he was intelligent hard working & deserving.

11-11-1876 (sd) A H Garrett
Assistant Engineer

The bearer Krishnasami Iyer has been employed under my orders for a period of three years. He was first entertained as Monegar & subsequently as anient Superintendent in the Tanjore & Mannargudi Ranges. I always found him diligent & attentive.