a burthen to anyone who has to deal with him, and his services must be dispensed with

9/3/82

C.A.W.

Please issue the necessary papers dispensing ~~with~~ Mr Courts Services —

10.3.82

and the Supdg Engr
recommends the
Court's dismissal
as he considers
+ With Mr Court
"he will never prove"
"a useful subordinate"
———

On the whole the
Court appears to be
very useless and
judging by the
papers I have read
over regarding him
I do not think the
Dept would lose much
by Dispensing with
his services

9.3.82

DAW -

It is clearly useless
to go on year after
year threatening a
man of this inert
nature — He is evidently

4 He has in no
" single instance shown
" any desire to push on
" with his works and
" repeated reminders
" and threats have been
" used on many occasions
" before he would answer
" references ———

In paras 5.6.7. of
the Ex Engr's Report
and the statement
appended thereto — of
" neglected correspondence
and orders — ~~will~~ are
~~be~~ found instances
of ~~the Court's~~ repeated
of the Court's short-
comings ———

The Court makes a
lengthy reply to this
report of the Ex. Engr
which neither the
Supdg Engr nor the
Asst Engr considers
satisfactory ——— In this view the C.E. concurs — + as also in the opinion of the S.E. +

From Sec
9.3.82

ent, taking into Consideration
his length of Service
in the Dept. viz 9 3/4
years up to April 1st
1877 he gave him
another Chance, at
the same time warning
him that " unless
" the Dist-Engineer's
" Quarterly returns show
" a marked improvement
" in the mode in which
" the Court-conducts
" his duties his
" Services will be
" dispensed with —

— In a report
dated 4th Feby 1882
the Ex. Engr. Nellore
Division says —
" I have every reason to be
" very much dissatisfied
" with the Progress made
" the Court is Completely
" wanting in Energy —

+ ho.

W.
Your note of 8.3.82

Mr Court was reduced from 2nd to 3rd grade Overseer in 1876 for not taking proper care of Govt money

G No. d/

In April 1878 the Chief Engr found it necessary to threaten Mr Court with dismissal in consequence of his having been repeatedly reported ~~upon~~ upon unfavorably

H No. d/

In ~~April~~ May 78 1878 the District Engineer Bellary again brought "prominently "to notice the unsatisfactory "conduct of Overseer Court"

I No. d/

On this report the Chief Engineer recorded his opinion that Mr Court "richly deserves dismissal"

List of papers &c relating to the Conduct of Overseer C. E. Court.

1 Memo No 1876 of 22nd April 1877 from the Chief Engineer P.W.D. to the District Engineer Bellary

1 No 454 of 26th — do — from the District Engineer Bellary to the Chief Engineer P.W.D.

1 G.O. No 472-I. of 7th June 1878.

1 Memo No 2822 of 27th — do — from the Chief Engineer P.W.D. to the District Engineer, Bellary

1 Register of Mr C E Court, for Quarter ending 31st March 1878.

1 Service Book

1 Report on Mr C. E. Court, dated 4th February 1882, with 2 enclosures.

1 Letter No 127 of 7th February 1882 from Mr Court to the Executive Engineer

1 Executive Engineer's Remarks on Overseer's explanation.

1 Statement of monthly expenditure.

Superintending Engineer's Office
2nd Circle, Masulipatam
3rd March 1882

J. W. Rundall
Superintending Engineer,
2nd Circle.

Enclosure to No 354 N L dated 3rd March 1882 from the Supg Engineer 2nd Circle to the Chief Engineer P.W.D.

P.W.D.

No 1876 dd 22d April 1878.

Memorandum.

For sometime past the quarterly reports upon the professional qualifications and general conduct of the Public Works Subordinates of the Bellary District named below having been most unsatisfactory the Chief Engineer desires that the District Engineer of Bellary at once warns the individuals in question that unless they immediately show greater zeal and energy in the performance of their duties, are more successful in carrying them out, and improve in general conduct, arrangements must be made by the

District Engineer to dispense with their Services and no longer permit their presence in the Department to impede its efficiency.

3rd Grade Overseer, J. Carroll
3rd —— " ——, C. Masilamoney Mudaly
3rd —— " ——, C. E. Court
3rd —— " ——, G. Venkatasawmy Naidu.

The latter individual should at once be directed to take steps to obtain his pension

(Sd) E. A. Ford Col R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.

To
The District Engineer
Bellary

No March 12
1494

No 454. Bellary

District Engineer's Office
26th April /78.

From
The District Engineer P.W.D.
To The Chief Engineer P.W.D. Madras.

Sir,

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your Memo No 1876 of the 22d Instant regarding certain inefficient Overseers.

2. Masilamoney Mudalley and Mr Court have been warned as directed by you.

3. Previous to the receipt of your order, I had myself taken steps for placing G. Venkatasawmy Naidu on the pension list

4. With regard to Overseer Mc Carroll he has since I took charge of the charge of the District been reported by Lieutenant Smither for dilatoriness, for taking no interest in his work and for not keeping himself properly equipped

5. There is quite enough on record concerning this Overseer's want of zeal and his general inefficiency to warrant his dismissal but before taking this step, I wished to judge for myself regarding him and his work. It was merely want of personal knowledge of him that has kept me from dismissing him.

If

If when I visit the Alur Taluk, I find his work bad and if his journals continue to show the same unsatisfactory results which they have hitherto, I shall consider it my duty to dispense with his services. Your warning has been communicated to him. I warned himself about 3 weeks ago.

I have &c

(Sd J W Rundall

Dt. Engineer Bellary

1494

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

7th June 1878, No. 472 I.

Irrigation.

Read the following paper:—

No. 22. From J. W. RUNDALL, Esq., District Engineer, Bellary, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Bellary, 16th May 1878, No. 768.

WITH reference to the list of Objectionable Items, Irrigation, published in G.O., No. 27 I, of the 12th January 1878, I have the honor to report as follows regarding Items 1 to 7 which appertain to this district.

Item No. 1—*Repairing Ramdroog Tank.*—This is one of the works on which fraud was committed by late Overseer Johnson. The matter was reported to the Chief Engineer in District Engineer's No. 556 of 15th May 1876. The sum charged by this Overseer was Rupees 341. The value of work done, as measured, is shown in accompanying bill and amounted to Rupees 280-9-6, leaving Rupees 60-6-6 to be written off to profit and loss; and this, I would request, the Examiner may be authorised to pass.

Item No. 2—*Goondanhully Tank, closing breaches, Rupees* 1,911.—This is another of Overseer Johnson's fraudulent works. I forward a bill showing the value of work done, and request that the balance, viz., Rupees 323-9-1, may be written off.

Item No. 3—*Repairing Gudakota Tank, supply channel, Rupees* 296.—This is likewise another of Overseer Johnson's fraudulent works. I forward a bill for Rupees 180-6-3, value of work done, and request that the balance, Rupees 115-9-9, may be written off.

The above three bills are prepared from measurements made by Mr. O'Leary, Supervisor, in December 1875, and I cannot understand why the amounts have been allowed to remain unadjusted so long.

The commencement of repairs to each of these tanks on emergency was authorised by Colonel Foord, R.E., when District Engineer here. The fact that Mr. Johnson was prosecuted but not convicted is recorded in G.O., of the 10th January 1877, No. 84.

With regard to *Item No.* 4, *repairing Kunchur Tank, Rupees* 2,888, I have the honor to report that an estimate for this work has been one year and seven months under preparation by Overseer C. E. Court. A bill for the work done was made out by this Overseer, but the work seems never to have been check-measured by a competent officer. This I will either do myself or have done shortly. The reason of its not having been checked is doubtless the constant change of officers in the Hospett Range, but the work was nearly all executed during the time Mr. Norfor held the Hospett Range.

I would beg to bring prominently to notice the unsatisfactory conduct of Overseer Court in connection with this work; the estimate was called for repeatedly by the then Range Officer Mr. Norfor; the Overseer took from October 1876 to

June 1877 to prepare it, and has taken from July 1877 to May 1878 to revise it after it was returned by the late District Engineer for correction. It was received by Mr. Christie, the present Range Officer, on the 1st instant, and will be forwarded to you shortly. It was still incorrectly made out by the Overseer and it was necessary to recast it entirely. The drawings for the Kunchur Tank show that Overseer Court knows how to work if he cares to apply himself.

It will be seen, I trust, from the foregoing explanation, that this objectionable item can only be removed when the Overseer's bill has been checked, but after so long a time I am afraid no satisfactory check-measurement can be obtained. On this point I will report hereafter.

Item No. 5—Maintenance of Tungabudra Channels.—These estimates were forwarded to you, but returned with your memorandum No. 7 B.L. of the 14th February. As the greater part of the work had been done, although the estimates were not prepared with proper accuracy, I was obliged to appropriate funds (on authority of the Collector's sanction to these repair estimates) to cover the past expenditure.

I hope next year to have the estimates correctly prepared.

Item No. 6—Gotlur Tank, removing body wall.—The estimate in which this item is embodied was returned with your memorandum No. 21 B.L., dated 23rd March 1878, for further details, and is now under revision. I would suggest this expenditure being passed on bill, and have directed the Range Officer to forward one which will be sent on. The item is distinct in itself, and can be adjusted independently of the work still to be carried out.

The removal of the body wall was authorised by Colonel Foord, R.E., when District Engineer, as mentioned in his letter, No. 374, of the 14th June 1875, to your address, but no estimate seems to have been sanctioned.

The sum of Rupees 918 includes the cost of removing some of the high ground left in front of the escapes.

Item No. 7—Repairs to Kaggal Tank, Rupees 701.—These estimates have also been received back for revision with your memorandum No. 22 B.L. of the 25th March 1878. In this case also it would be better to account for the sum already spent independently and to prepare the estimate for the tank as it is. I have therefore directed the Range Officer to prepare a bill which will be forwarded.

I will get the three bills still due sent on as soon as possible, and thus clear off these objectionable items.

No. 23. ORDER THEREON, 7th June 1878, No. 472 I.

THE Examiner of Public Works Accounts is authorised to pass the expenditure, in excess of the value of work done, on the following works in the Bellary District, viz. :—

	RS.	A.	P.
Ramdroog Tank	60	6	6
Goondanhully Tank	323	9	1
Gudakota Tank, supply channel	115	9	9

2. The irregularity of spending Rupees 2,887 on the Kunchur Tank without an estimate must not be repeated. Overseer C. E. Court's omission to attend to the rules will be noticed by the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, this subordinate having been employed in the department for 9¾ years up to 1st April 1877. The District Engineer will take care that such disposal of the bill as may be necessary is not delayed. The Examiner is authorised to pass the charge if a satisfactory completion certificate should be submitted.

Items 5, 6, and 7.

3. The expenditure on the Tungabudra channels repairs, the Gotlur and Kaggal tanks may be passed as though estimates had been sanctioned. The District Engineer will take care that similar irregularities do not recur. Emergent work only can be done in anticipation of the sanction of an estimate, and as the sanction in such cases can always be accorded locally there can be no admissible excuse for delay, and the adjustment of the expenditure should be made forthwith.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.,
Irrigation Branch.

To the District Engineer, Bellary.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
" Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

Exd. C. Howarth.

Spare Copies

IRRIGATION.

Govt. of {1878} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

M. Encl. 10
1494 / 12

To

THE DISTRICT ENGINEER,
BELLARY,
&c., &c., &c.

Dated June 7th.

Issued

Recd. *Encl.*

G. O., 7th June 1878, No. 472 I.

JUNE.

Nos. 22-23.

Expenditure in excess of value of work done in the Bellary District.—The Examiner of Public Works Accounts authorised to pass the — with remarks.

P.W.D.

No. 2822 d/ 27th June 1878.

Memorandum

With reference to para 2 of G.O. No 472 I. dated 7th June 1878 the Chief Engineer has already been in communication with the District Engineer Bellary in reference to Mr Overseer Court's general shortcomings, want of energy and neglect of duty. He is again prominently brought to notice in the G.O. above quoted. Though he richly deserves dismissal the Chief Engineer taking into consideration the length of service in the Department determines to give him another chance of regaining the confidence of his superior officers and now finally warns him that unless the District Engineer's quarterly returns show a marked improvement in the mode in which Mr Court conducts his duties, his services will be dispensed with. It is very evident that if Mr Court likes he is quite capable of doing good work and giving satisfaction. The District Engineer will be careful to note in each quarterly report if Mr Court's conduct has improved to such an extent as to justify his retention in the service or not.

[illegible] 9
14.4

(Sd) W Farewell Col
Dy Chief Engineer Rds

To
The District Engineer
Bellary

Report for the Quarter ending 31 March/78

EXAMPLE.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Register of (Mr C. E. Court)

1. Name with Military and Departmental rank and corps and nationality.	Overseer 3d Grade East Indian
2. Date of entering Public Works Department.	13 July 1867
3. Date of first Commission if a Royal Engineer Officer, and of commencing professional work if a Civil Engineer.	"
4. Date of birth.	2d July 1847
5. Tests passed.	Overseer
6. Lingual attainments. } Native languages,	Can speak, read & write Tamil Telugu & Canarese with a colloquial knowledge of Hindustany
7. Whether a good rider generally of active habits, and whether a fairly healthy man.	Good rider – inactive healthy
8. Whether a good man of business irrespective of professional qualifications.	Not very
9. If successful in arranging for and pushing on work.	Fairly so
10. Class of works in which chiefly experienced.	Road making
11. Any special qualification.	None
12. Nature of work on which now employed.	In charge of Harpenhalli Taluk

13. General remarks. Very dilatory, not recommended for promotion

14. Whether ever reduced, if so, from what rank and offence. Reduced from 2d to 3d grade overseer in June 1876 for not taking proper care of Government money

15. Whether married or single, wife's nationality. Married
East Indian

If married, number of children. One Child

Whether the foregoing particulars are inserted on personal knowledge of immediate superior, or only from previous returns. From returns of late District Engineer, Range office & records.

Sd/ J. W. Rundall
Dt Engineer Bellary

1/2 Encl 8
1494

THE ENTRIES IN THESE COLUMNS ARE TO BE REATTESTED EVERY FIVE YEARS; EACH ATTESTATION SHOULD BE CAREFULLY RULED OFF THE DATE MAY BE CLEARLY SHOWN.

Name of Officer.	Caste or Race.	Residence.	Father's Name.	Father's Residence.	Date of birth.	Age. Years	Age. Ms.	Age. Days.	Exact Height. Feet.	Exact Height. In.	Personal marks for identification.	Date of Entry.	Signature of Officer.	Signature and designation of the head of the Office.
Charles Edward Conik	Eurasian	Hurpunhully.—	John Henry Conik	Deceased	2d July 1847.—	25	8	29	5'	6"	A scar on left arm just above the elbow 1½ inch long by ½ inch wide.	1st April 1873.	C E Conik	

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, i.e., whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination e. g., *transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.
Talug Overseer 3rd Grade Bellary Range	substantive appointment Permt	Priv. Leave from 14 June to 31 July 1871	60 ~~80.0.0~~	..	13.7.67		No pay drawn from 5 to 7 May 1873 and from 18 to 21 Dec 1874 on account of overstay of Sick Leave.		28.2.68	Transfer	
Do Raidroog Range	Do		60		1.3.68				31.1.70	Do	
Do Hospetta Do	Do		60		1.2.70				30.6.72	~~Do~~ Promotion	
Overseer 2d Grade Hospetta Range	Do		80.0.0	..	1.7.72		Reduced to Overseer 3d Grade by Chief Engineer for loss of Govt. Cash from 1 June 76		31.5.76	Reduced	
Sick leave from 21st April to 4th May 1873											
Sick leave from 22nd ~~October~~ October to 17th December 1874											
Leave without pay from 7th to 14th January ~~June~~ 1875											
Privilege leave for 39 days from 24th December 1876 to 31st Jany 77											
Overseer 3rd Gr Hospetta Range	Permt	Priv. Leave from 6 May to 3rd June 1880	60		1.6.76		Restored to 2d grade with effect from 17th February 1879. Vide Fort St George Gazette of 17th February 1879. C.E.	C.E.	31.10.78	Transfer	C.E.
Do Bellary Dn	Do		60		1.11.78				16.2.79	Restored to 2nd Gr.	
Overseer 2nd Gr Bellary Dn	Do		80		17.2.79				31.3.80	Transfer	
Do Nellore Dn	Do		80		1.4.80		Mr Court was with me as an Overseer for upwards of one (1) year and I have every reason to be well satisfied with his work & duties as performed by him. His conduct has always been very good. C.E. Bellary 13th April 1880	C.E.			C.E.

The services of Mr C. E. Court Overseer 2nd Grade from 13 July 1867 to 31 October 1881 checked and verified by the Examiner's Office.

Examiner
P.W. Accts, Madras

3/12

1 Name of appointment.	2 Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	3 Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	4 Pay.	5 Acting allowance.	6 Date of appointment.	7 Signature of Officer.	8 Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	9 Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	10 Date of termination of appointment.	11 Reason of termination *e.g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	12 Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Name of appointment.	Nature, *i.e.*, whether substantive or acting, permanent or temporary.	Substantive appointment, if the new appointment be acting only.	Pay.	Acting allowance.	Date of appointment.	Signature of Officer.	Character of Officer. *No entry need be made in this Column except when there is any thing either good or bad to be recorded. Suspensions should be noted here when the order of suspension is passed.*	Signature & designation of immediate head of the Office.	Date of termination of appointment.	Reason of termination *e. g., transfer, promotion, return of permanent incumbent.*	Signature and designation of immediate head of the Office.

3

No. 1485
20 12 0
ENC. —

1494

SERVICE BOOK
OF
Name. Charles Edward Court
Caste or Race. Eurasian
Residence. Hyderabad Dn.
FATHER'S. Name. John Henry Court
Residence. Deceased
Date of birth. 2nd July 1847.

Report on Mr. C. E. Court, Taluq Overseer, Nellore Divn

1. Mr. Court was transferred to Nellore from Bellary in April 1880, on arrival he took a month's sick leave and he was then posted to Gudur where he remained about a month too ill to do any work. In July '80 he was transferred to Kandukur and placed in charge of the works in progress in Ongole, Kanigiri, Kandukur and Kavali Taluqs, finding that the works were not being pushed on and that Mr. Court's charge was too extensive, in January 1881 he was relieved of the Kavali Taluq and in May '81 as he still showed want of energy, half the Kandukur Taluq was taken from him.

2. I inspected Mr. Court's charge in May 1881, again in August of the same year and I am now making my third tour in Ongole, I have every reason to be very much dissatisfied with the progress made, Mr. Court is completely wanting in energy and he makes excuses for short work by saying that he cannot get labor while he does nothing whatever to obtain it. The Overseer in the next Taluq has no difficulty in getting labor and he has turned out a great deal of work while Mr. Court has done very little.

3. Owing to the extent of the Division, to the distance of Ongole from Head Quarters and to there being no Sub-Div^{n} Officer. Mr Court has necessarily been left a good deal to himself, he has in no single instance shown any desire to push on with his works and repeated reminders and threats have been used on many occasions before he ~~will~~ would answer references.

4. Mr Court has sent in only one Estimate for the complete repair of a Tank though he has numerous Tanks in his charge. For some months he has not been allowed to quit Ongole because he wrote that during his absence the two Buildings there had to be stopped, the progress with these Buildings has been all along exceedingly slow, one a House for Sub-Collector has been 12 months in hand, the other a Registrars Office has been six months in progress, neither of these buildings is finished.

5. The following instances of neglect and idleness are selected to show how Mr Court has behaved.

On 12th April '81 he was informed that Teak Couples for Sub-Collector's House were ready in Nellore, he wrote on 19th April that he was ready for them and on 18th May he acknowledged their receipt, the details of the Timber so acknowledged did not agree with what was despatched from Nellore and on 13th July I called on Mr Court to send a list of the missing articles without delay, on 5th August an urgent reminder was sent and Mr Court sent the list on 7th August, after two and a half months the deficiency was known but it was then too late to make any useful enquiry, as the Cart-hire had been withheld there was no loss to Government.

On 28th July Mr Court was asked to report if the roof timbers were complete and correctly cut and on 7th August Mr Court reported that they were correct except two end Rafters not provided in the Estimate, on 11th November Mr Court wrote that owing to the Plan of the Building having been incorrectly drawn the Verandah Rafters were too short and he asked for 76 pieces each 3 feet long to scarf them, on receipt of my reply he discovered that he had a number of surplus rafters and that he did not require the 76 pieces at all; he had received the Rafters on 18th May and he did not put them up until November.

Mr Court had failed to find out the errors in the Plan though the work had been in progress since January and at my inspection at end of August I urged him to put on the [illegible] roof at once and I saw the necessary scaffolding then in progress.

6. With the very large executive charges now existing it is not possible to look very closely after any Overseer, his work cannot be checked more than once in 3 months and if he is inclined to be idle there is no way of keeping him under constant supervision. Appended is a Statement of some letters sent to Mr Court which shows how slack he has been in replying to references, he is I fear incorrigible I do not complain that his work is bad but he does exceedingly little, often of less value in the month than his Salary.

7. In one instance Mr Court deliberately disobeyed written orders, on 24th June 81 he received orders about the setting out of the foundations of the Registrar's Office, on my inspection in August Mr Court had no explanation to give of having disobeyed my instructions.

Ongole
4th Feb. 82

C B Henderson
Ex. Engr. 4. D. LNR

Mr [illegible] 1494/82

Statement of a few of the cases in which Mr Court delayed replying to letters from Executive Engineer

No. and date of Ex. Engrs letter	Subject	Reminders sent	Date of Mr Court's replies	Remarks
559 of 25th May 1881	Calling for Work Abstracts	18th June '81 9th July " 15th July "	25th July '81	The last Reminder was sent Registered with a threat of suspension unless replied to by return post Copy of Ex. Engr No 836 of 27th July is sent herewith.
1224 of 10th Nov 1880	Calling for valuation of a Bungalow at Ongole	1st Feb '81 3rd March " 23rd March "	No reply sent	Valuation was subsequently sent by Mr Sub. Engineer Lastly
22 of 23rd April '81	Requesting Return of a Carpenter's Clamps	25th May '81	10th June '81	

No. & date of Ex. Engr. letter	Subject	Reminders sent	Date of Mr. Courts reply	Remarks
1039 of 28th Sept. '81	Calling for immediate explanation of high rates paid for certain works.	24th Oct. '81 27th Oct. '81	24th Oct. '81 2nd Nov. '81	Mr. Courts' explanation of the delay was very unsatisfactory, he had only 2 works in progress at the time.
389 of 29th March '81	Requesting Return of certain Bills	18th April '81	No reply sent	
890 of 11th August '81	Asking number of days that elapsed between receipt of Reepers and using them on roofs of out-buildings		No reply sent	Mr. Court had excused short work by saying that he had no reepers, after the reepers arrived he was a long time before he commenced to put them up.
653 of 17th June '81	Calling for explanation of delay of 6 weeks in submitting Estimates for Mocherla Tank after completion of all the Field Work.		No reply sent	

Note. The above are only a few out of many instances of neglect and delay. Mr. Court has had very little Office Work to do and he had not to write more than six or eight letters a month, he was repeatedly threatened that unless he replied promptly to references he would be reported to the Superintending Engineer but he did not amend; at last in any important matter the letter had to be Registered before despatch.

C B Henderson
Ex. Engr. N.D.

Pw Encl 5
1494 / fk

2. The Overseer, Ongole

Your No. 50 of 25th Instant.

Your explanation of the delay in sending work abstracts is by no means satisfactory, it is evident that for two or three months you paid no attention whatever to instructions and reminders for them within the last two weeks you really tried to commence them you had to apply time for certain records. Work abstracts are due in Division Office on the 3rd of each month, a considerable part of the Form can be prepared before the close of the month and the final entries and totals can be easily made in one day. I have twice been reported to Govt for delay in submitting abstracts for your works and if you fail to send them punctually severe measures must be taken to enforce obedience to my orders.

(Signed) C B. Henderson,
Lieut, R.E.
Executive Engineer

27th July 1881.

(True Copy)

C B Henderson
Ex. Eng. LNl

Nellore
20.2.82

Br Mch 4
1899 JR

Enclosure to No. 354 N.L.
dated 3rd March 1882
from the Supg Engineer, 2nd Circle
to the Chief Engineer P.W.D.

Report on Mr C. E. Couch
Taluq Overseer, by the
Executive Engineer, Nellore
Division

5

No. 127.

From

The Overseer in charge
Ongole Taluq

To

The Executive Engineer
Nellore Division.

Camp at Tangatoor
Dated 7th February 1882.
Received

Sir,

In reply to the report against me about to be submitted to the Superintending Engineer, I beg to send in the following explanation.—

(Para 1 of Report.) 1. As my charge after my transfer to the 4 Taluqs at the North of this District was considered too large, I was relieved of the Kavaly Taluq in January 1881.— In May 1881, when you inspected my Taluqs, you expressed yourself satisfied with the progress of work made by me on the Sub Collector's Quarters, as all the walls of the out-houses were raised ready to receive the roof, and in the Main Building also the walls were raised almost to the full height, while some of the arches in the old rooms were being constructed, and you told me at Kundukur that you still considered my charge as too large for one man to efficiently supervise, and then a further reduction was made by half of the Kundukur Taluq being handed over to the Overseer of Kavaly.—

(Para 2 of Report.) 2 If you will be pleased to remember, I said in explanation

planation of slow progress of work in Augt. that I found a difficulty in getting carpenters for the work – those that were worthy of employment demanding very high wages (14 annas and 1 Rupee each) which I could not afford to give as I was bound to keep within the rates of the Estimate.– There was a great deal of work being done on all sides in the town of Ongole by the inhabitants at the time – hence the difficulty in getting skilled labor – the few that came to my work being very ordinary workmen requiring constant supervision, and even for these I had to pay as much as 8 annas and 9 annas a day. I never found a difficulty in getting bricklayers here, and I reported the same to you – the difficulty was in getting good carpenters.– The Overseer of the next Taluq even wrote to me officially to send him bricklayers for his work there, as he had a number of works on hand, and he was told by you that there were many here.– When I was in charge of that Taluq (Kavaly) I had one work on hand, and found no difficulty in getting skilled labor for it, as they could always be commanded from there – Nellore being only 30 miles away.– As the charge that I do nothing whatever to obtain labor for my works is very serious, I beg to point out that at the time (August '81) I had no Maistry on the work, the man appointed by Mr. Lasky in February having been dismissed, and I was therefore obliged to do everything personally even to the procuring of daily labor.–

(Para 4 of Report.)

3. I sent up the complete Estimate for the Pokur Tank in August, and previously (in June) the Plans and Levels complete of the Mochurla Tank also, without the Estimate as I was directed to hand over the papers to the Overseer of Kavaly to whose charge the tank was then about to be transferred.– On 1st October I indented for Imperial Drawing Paper for drawing Plans to accompany Tank Estimates, and on the 19th idem, I sent a reminder for the same. The paper was subsequently sent to me at the beginning of November '81 and on the 15th idem on my return from inspecting and reporting on a tank that was stated to be in danger, I received a docket ordering me "to remain "at Ongole and not to leave it until the buildings "are finished" or until further orders.– I beg to state that a mistake liable to mislead is made in saying that I wrote to the effect that "during "my absence the two buildings here had to be "stopped," and that I was therefore not allowed to quit Ongole – on searching my letter book, I failed to find that I made such a statement, and beg therefore that this mistake may be corrected, or if I am wrong that it may be pointed out to me.–

The Sub-Collector's Quarters was in progress from the 14th February '81 up to the 29th December '81, a period of 10½ months. The walls of the buildings were up to the full height almost in May '81 and as the out-houses were constructed of brick in mud, I commenced the plastering of these at once to protect them from the S.W. Monsoon, and on receipt of the palmyra rafters from the Nellore Overseer at the beginning of July '81, I wanted to put on the roof at once, but this I could not do as the rafters were too fresh and had to be allowed to dry as they got distorted

on

on exposure to the sun and wind after removing the white wood off the inside. In August the work of trimming rafters was commenced with, and the roofing &ca completed at end of September.— The Cookroom was then taken in hand and completed at end of October, and then the Main Building was commenced with and continued until December when the estimated amount had been expended.— I beg further to state, I reported to you in August, that I had only 5400 Ry feet of Reepers of which 4600 Ry feet were required for the Outhouses (Stables and Cookroom) which were then taken in hand, and that the roof timbers of the Main Building could not then be put up as the then prevailing high wind rendered it highly dangerous to do so, as the whole may have been thrown down at any time destroying both walls and timber.

The Registry Office was put in progress on the 30th July and continued so uninterruptedly until 8th October, when the contractor failed to supply bricks, though repeatedly asked to do so, owing to his Stock being exhausted, and the rains preventing a fresh supply being made. He commenced supplying again on the 12th November, and on the 14th (Monday) work was resumed until this day uninterruptedly.— This work is now fast approaching completion, the flooring, painting with a small portion of the plastering alone remaining to be done.—

(Para 5 of the Report.)

4. I beg to state that it is a mistake that the timber acknowledged by me

in

in my No 16 of 18 May '81 was incorrect. They were quite correct as compared with your docket of advice No $\frac{143}{12.5.81}$ and No — of 13th idem. In your No 176S of 1st June '81 the dispatch on 5 carts of certain other roof timbers &c, was advised, and on the 10th and again on the 17th idem, I reported the arrival of the carts giving a list of articles as actually received each time by me, vide my Nos 27 of 10th June 1881 and 32 of 17 idem; I however could not pay the cartmen as there were some reepers missing as also portions of the Rafter and Reeper Nails, Woodoil and Dammer — the quantities received not agreeing with those in your docket of advice of the 1st idem No 176S.—

With reference to my report that the timbers were correctly cut, I beg to state that I did so on comparing the timbers with the estimated lengths and scantlings; it was only after they were put up that the rafters of the front Veranda were found too short owing to the actual width of the front Veranda and its pillars being greater than those shown on the plan from which the estimate was framed.

In my No 107 of 19th Nov: '81, I stated that I indented for 76 pieces 3' long in my No 104 of 11th idem as the projection of the Veranda Rafters should be 1'10" from the face of the bressummer, or 1' clear off the basement whereas the actual projections of the rafters varied from only 5½" to 1'6" as shown in the list accompanying; at the same time I said that as 27 of them project 1'2" from the face of the bressummer, or 4" clear from the basement, if this was thought sufficient, the

or

on exposure to the sun and wind after removing

only 2' long would be necessary, and that these could be made up from the surplus timber on hand. This was approved of and has since been carried out. The roof timbers and rafters were coming in from 18th May up to end of Augt. in instalments, a small portion being sent in in October. My reason for not putting on the Main Building roof was already explained in para 3 above.

{Para 6 of Report.
Para 3 of Report.}

5.— To show that I was not idle nor disinclined to push on with the work, I beg to point out that the Sub Collector's House Estimate (Rs 7365/-) was expended in 10½ Months, and the Registry Office Estimate (Rs 2295) has been in progress and will be completed within 8 Months, inclusive of the delay caused by the failure of the Contractor to supply Materials for a period of over 1 Month, (the wood-work and doors of both buildings being sent up from the Cullore Workshop).— In contrast to this I beg to represent that the School House at Oryole (Estimate Rs 9000/-) was in progress for some period (about 4 or 5 years, when the Oryole Division was in existence, Mr. Ottmann, the then Range Officer having imported skilled labor from Madras and elsewhere to do this work and the Sub Collector's Cutcherry rather than employ the inferior workmen here.— When I was transferred here, there was still work remaining to be done on the School-House, and I completed it, at less than the estimated rates by a great deal.— On the two works under my charge here now, the Sub Collector's House and Registrar's office, I have bestowed a good deal of time and pains, having stood for days in the sun supervising work, and I can confidently state that from foundation to roof there is not a particle of scamped work to be found.—

(Para 7 of Report.)

6.— In this instance, I beg to state that I did not deliberately disobey orders received, but simply made an error.— If I had disobeyed orders, I beg to represent that the width of the room would have been 18' only as per plan and Estimate, that is, the centre lines of the main walls would have been 19' 6" apart while in fact they were found to have been 20' 2"; the order being that the "centre "of the new walls should be in prolongation of "centre of old walls," that is, 20' apart.— This mistake I subsequently rectified as pointed out to you, by moving the centre line of the walls 2" nearer, that is 1" nearer than the centre line of the basement. I had no explanation to offer when asked about it, as I could not account for the error made.— The line was laid out by me on the 30th July 1881, with a tape and pegs and twine, and the error must have been caused by the stretching of the latter or by a mistake in my calculations.— It could hardly have been the latter as they were too simple.— In connection with this, I beg to state that I made the foundations wider at the bottom than provided for in the Estimate (as the 4' width of concrete was omitted owing to the hard gravel reached at the bottom) giving it a batter on both sides of 1 in 3, and thus securing the average width of 3 feet as per estimate. The

widt

on exposure to the sun and wind after removing

width I gave it was 4' at bottom and 2' at top, the latter being the width of the basement also.– This met with your approval when represented to you at the time of your inspection in August last.

(No 559 of 25th May)

7.– This was received by me ~~on the~~ early in June on my return to Ongole.– I at once commenced with the preparation of the work abstracts called for by compiling the necessary information from the accounts of the Maistry in charge of the work.– I had no writer at the time, and I had single-handed to compile the return which was quite new to me and consequently not well understood by me. On the 17th idem, a writer was appointed by me temporarily as directed by you, and we got the returns ready. As part IV of the work abstracts required great details to be gone into to bring up the proper balances, I was obliged to send up on the 11th of July 1881 to your Office for the 10-day reports from February to April to enable me to calculate and bring up the returns up to date.– The accounts in the hands of the Maistry being in a state of confusion. These were received by me on the 17th idem, and the work abstracts were sent in complete up to date on the 25th idem, with full explanation of the cause of delay.–

(No 1224 of 10th Nov: 80)

8.– This was received by me on the 16th idem. I was much engaged at this time in superintending cyclone-damaged Tanks that were then under repair, and in February and March, in travelling about with Mr Lasking, Sub Engineer, measuring up and making bills for work done in the On-

gole

gole, Kundukur and Kanagiri Talugs.– I had no writer at the time, and had to make out all bills with measurement lists in duplicate myself.– On the 23rd March, I handed over the Plan and Valuation Estimate to Mr Lasking to be forwarded by him with his remarks as to the state of the buildings.–

(No 22 of 23rd April 1881.)

9.– The Carpenter's clamp was taken to Kanagiri, by the Maistry direct from the Divisional office, and I knew nothing of it.– On making inquiries, I found out where it was, ~~and~~ ordered the Maistry to send it up from Kanagiri at once, but he, having been dismissed at the end of March, did not do so until the end of May 1881. It was received at Ongole early in June, and returned by me to the Divisional Store on the 10th of June by one of the return carts to Nellore.–

(No 1039 of 28th Sept: '81)

10.– In my No 94 of 2nd Oct: 1881, I explained fully the cause of not sending a reply earlier than the 24th October '81, as I had to go carefully into all the accounts to supply the detailed information called for, besides which, there was an error in the quantity of work shown in your docket, and as I was not sure about it, I was obliged to be very careful in my survey of the accounts; I subsequently found out that it was a clerical error committed in your office as all my accounts tallied with each other. In the same letter, I reported that both your reminders were received at Ongole during my absence therefrom, and that they only came into my hands on that date after my return to Ongole, and were replied to immediately.–

on exposure to the sun and wind after removing

(No 389 of 29th March 1881.) 11.– This docket with its enclosures were sent by mistake to Mr. Laskey Sub Engineer, and then to me on his returning it.– The docket bears Mr. Laskey's date of receipt as the 9th of May, with a remark to the Accountant to send the same on to me.– It was received by me on the 15th of May, and the enclosures (bills) despatched on the 16th idem

(No 890 of 11th Augt. '81) 12.– With regard to this, I explained to you personally at Tungatoor on the 27th of August that I did not reply to the docket as up to that date no repairs had been put up. It was only after our return to Ongole on the 28th, that repairs were put up – this having been commenced on the 29th idem

(No 653 of 17th June '81) 13. This docket was not replied to.– It must have been mislaid accidentally with the dockets replied to, and hence escaped my attention.–

I beg to remain
Sir
Yr. Most Obedt. Servant
Chas. E. Court,
Overseer – Ongole

From
Mr. C. E. Court,
Overseer,
Ongole
to
The Executive Engr
Nellore.

Dated 7' Feby 82

No. 127

Explanation on the
~~against~~ for the delays
brought to notice

on exposure to the sun and wind after removing

Pr Encl 3/1494 /K

From

Mr. C. E. Court,
Overseer,
Ongole

To

The Executive Engr
Nellore.

Dated 7th Feby 82

No. 127.

Offering Explanation on ~~ur~~ ~~against~~ for the charges brought against

---

Executive Engineer's Remarks on the explanations offered by Mr. Court.

---

1. In May 1881 when I first saw the Sub. Collector's House at Ongole the work was going on well, labor was plentiful and no difficulty was made about materials, at the rate then in progress the Buildings could have been completed easily in 3 months.

2. When asked if he had tried to get Carpenters from Kavali or Kandukur, Mr. Court said that he had done nothing. All the roof timbers were cut and framed at the Nellore Workshops, no skilled labor whatever was required at Ongole. No Maistry was required for such simple works, but I allowed 3 per cent on value of work done to pay for a Gumastah, who was employed by Mr. Court.

3. The delay of six weeks in submitting Plans and Estimates refers to Mocherla Tank for which the Overseer was provided with paper before he had finished the field work.

4. Mr. Court certainly excused his slow progress at Ongole by reporting that during his absence nothing was done

and his excuse that the high wind prevented him for four months from putting up the couples for roof of Main Building is a very poor one, the couples are not heavy and he had plenty of scaffolding.

Bk Mark 2
1494

C B Henderson
LWR
Ex. Eng

Nellore
20 - 2 - '82

No 90

Statement Showing the Cash payments made by Mr. Court—

Forwarded to Supg. Eng. 2nd Circle as requested in his Telegram of 24th Inst.

Months	Amounts			Remarks
January 1881	58	4	8	This Expenditure was incurred by the Overseer on labor alone all materials were arranged for by the Executive Engineer and paid for separately by cheque.
March 1881	109	15	11	
Do	228	12	10	
April 1881	160	14	2	
June 1881	213	3	3	
Do	57	4	6	
Do	155	10	9	
July 1881	37	15	8	
August 1881	129	4	7	
September 1881	166	4	3	
October 1881	104	6	4	
Do	97	8	6	
November 1881	108	15	10	
Do	8	14	8	
December 1881	93	3	..	
January 1882	99	10	10	
Do	114	2	10	
Carried over	1944	8	7	

Brought Over	1944	8	7
February 1882	78	9	9
Total Amount Rupees	2023	2	4

The entries correspond with recoupments of Overseer's Imprest

C B J Henderson
Lieutt R.E.
Executive Engineer Nellore Division

Exec: Engr's Office Nellore Dn.
Nellore 27th February 1882

14/ 2023
144

373 N.L.
3/3/82

From,

The Executive Engineer
Nellore Division.

To,

The Superintending
Engineer 2nd Circle

[illegible]

Dated 27th } Feby 1882.
Recd

No 90.

Statement shewing the Cash payments made by Mr Court from January 1881 to Feby 1882.

No. 354 N.L. SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE 2nd CIRCLE
STATION Masulipatam, 3rd March 1882.

FROM,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
2nd Circle.

TO,

THE Chief Engineer
Public Works Department.

SIR,

Enclosures.

I have the honor to forward for your orders the papers noted in the accompanying list, relating to the Conduct of Overseer C. E. Court at present attached to the Nellore Division, and to recommend, in Consequence of this Overseers continued dilatoriness and unsatisfactory Conduct, that his services be dispensed with.

2. When I took charge of the Circle, Lieut. Henderson reported to me that he could not get any work out of Mr. Court, and as this had been my own experience when I was District Engineer of Bellary in 1878, I obtained from your Office the papers relating to Mr. Court which form accompaniments to this letter.

3. Taking now Lieutenant Henderson's Report on the Overseer, and Mr Court's reply, I would remark that, Lieutenant Henderson's Charges are that this Overseer is (1) unable to Carry out works (2) that he is dilatory in making Estimates, and (3) that he fails to reply promptly to references.

As regards (1) Lieutenant Henderson did not send with the papers any statement as to the extent of work which the Overseer had Carried out, and this I have accordingly obtained from him. From this statement it appears that, the Overseer's average monthly expenditure during the last 14 months has been Rs 144, while from 4th para of Lieutenant Henderson's Report, it appears that neither of the Buildings to which the Overseer has been supervising has been completed, though from Mr Court's explanation it would appear that the Registrar's Office will be finished shortly. Mr Court's neglect to find out that the plan of the Sub Collector's Quarters was incorrect, till he proceeded to put up the roof, Considering he was employed almost solely on this work, is inexcusable and indicates with sufficient Clearness the unsatisfactory way in which he works.

As regards (2) with only 2 Buildings to supervise at his Head Quarters, Mr Court should have been able to take levels and work up Estimates for the Complete repair of Several tanks. He has sent in one Estimate and taken and plotted levels for one other tank. Lieutenant Henderson states he was 6 weeks in plotting the latter. This is a precisely similar instance of neglect to that which occurred with regard to the Kunchier Tank. In his inspection notes under date the 2nd February, Lieutenant Henderson notes that Mr Court has failed to prepare a revised Estimate for the Sub Collector's House, regarding which he had received written orders 2 months previously.

As regards (3), Mr Court's explanations are more satisfactory, he seems to have been without a writer for some time, but at the same time from Mr Court's having so little work to supervise, and from his not having done any field work, it is certain that all letters might have been replied to promptly had Mr Court exerted himself.

4. On a review of the whole, and taking Mr Court's previous Character into Consideration, I believe that he will never prove an useful Subordinate, and consider he should be dismissed. I would however note that, from the time I left Bellary in October 1878, till I came across Mr Court again in November 1881, there is only one recorded opinion regarding his work, viz by Colonel Fisher R.E. and that is favorable.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obdt Servant
J. W. Rundall
Superintending Engineer,
2nd Circle

P. W. C. No 1494

From

The Superintending Engineer
2nd Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Dept.

Dated 3rd } March 1882
Recd 8 }
No 629.C d/14-3-82
No 354 N.L.

Enclosures. Thirteen.

Court C. E. Mr - Overseer Nellore Division - Conduct of - Bringing to notice the - for consideration and Orders.

No C. No 629.C

P.W. Department,
Chepauk, 14th March 1882

Memorandum

From,
The Supdg Engineer 2nd Circle (A.E. No 354 N.L. d/3rd March 1882)

With the letter read above the Supdg Engineer 2nd Circle forwards for orders correspondence relating to the conduct of Overseer Mr C. E. Court, and he recommends, in consequence of the Overseer's continued dilatoriness and unsatisfactory conduct generally, that his services be dispensed with.

2. Before dealing with the present complaints, the Chief Engineer has carefully

reviewed Mr. Court's previous career in the Department. He finds that he was & reduced from 2nd to 3rd grade Overseer in 1876 for not taking proper care of Government money.

& 1st June

3. In April 1878, the Chief Engineer found it necessary to threaten * Mr. Court with dismissal in consequence of his having been repeatedly reported upon unfavorably.

* No. 1876 d/ 22nd April

4. In May 1878, the District Engineer, Bellary, again brought * "prominently to notice "the unsatisfactory conduct "of Overseer Court."

* 16th May No. 768

5. On this report, the Chief Engineer ⊙ recorded his opinion that Mr. Court "richly deserves dismissal" but taking into consideration his length of service in the Department, viz. 9¾ years up to April 1st 1877 he gave him another chance, at the same time warning him that "unless the "District Engineer's quarterly "returns show a marked "improvement in the mode "in which Mr. Court conducts "his duties his services will "be dispensed with.

⊙ C.E. No. 2822 d/ 27th June 1878

6. In a report dated 4th February 1882, the Executive Engineer Nellore Division says.—

"I have every reason to "be very much dissatisfied "with the progress made—

"Mr. Court is completely "wanting in energy." He "has in no single instance "shewn any desire to push "on with his works and "repeated reminders and "threats have been used "on many occasions before "he would answer references."

7. In paras 5, 6, 7, of the Executive Engineer's report and the Statement appended thereto, of neglected correspondence and orders, are found instances of repeated short comings.

8. Mr. Court makes a lengthy reply to this report of the Executive Engineer's which neither the Supty. Engr. nor the Executive Engineer considers satisfactory. In this view the Chief Engineer concurs, as also in the opinion of the Supty. Engineer that Mr. Court "will never prove a "useful Subordinate."

9. Under these circumstances, the Chief Engineer is convinced that it is clearly useless to go on year after year threatening a man of the inert nature evinced by Mr. Court. He is evidently a burden to every officer who has to deal with him. The Chief Engineer accordingly directs that his services be dispensed with from the date on which these

orders may be communicated to him, which should be reported for record.

R.J.

11.3.82

11-3-82

No 629 C of 14-3-82

Supdg Engr 2d Circle ✓
Examiner P.W. Accts with Extract para 9. ✓
Despd
14/3/82

Entd in Receipt Regr

Do/5/3

No 2078 C of 14th Nov/82 P.W.D.

Appendices

A.

Mr. Overseer Court at present in charge of the Hurpunhully Taluq, Hospett Range, Bellary District has paſsed the full Test for Taluq Overseer as also the examination in the Tamil language. His honesty and sobriety are, I believe, unquestionable, and he prepares his estimates and plans accurately & carefully. The latter he draws with much neatneſs.

(Signed) A. Lyon
Aſst. Engineer
20th Jany 1875. in charge Hospett Range

B.

From

The Executive Engineer
Hospett Division

To

Mr. Court
Overseer. D.P.W.
Hurponhully

True Copy of a Letter to the addreſs of the Executive Engineer, Bellary Division, being an Endorsement on Mr. Court's letter, No. 139, dated 21st Novr. 1878, is forwarded for information.

I have the honor to enclose a letter to your addreſs from Mr. Court. The Overseer's Statement is temperately worded and I request the favour of your bringing the matter to the notice of Col: Prendergast

for

for submission to the Chief Engineer.

Mr Court has been under me for the last 7 months and my opinion of him is that he gets up his Estimates carefully, draws his plans very neatly and, judging from what has been done by him with famine labour on the Koonchoor tank, he executes his work in a careful way. I shall be glad if you can get him re-instated in his former grade. Soon after my arrival here Mr Court got reprimanded by the Chief Engineer for delay in submitting Estimates. I have not, however, found him dilatory in this respect during my tenure of Office here.

(True Copy)

(Signd) W. B. Christie

Executive Engineer

—— C. ——

As I am shortly leaving the Range. I have much pleasure in certifying that Mr Court, Taluq Overseer, Harpanally, has during the (8) Eight months of his service under my orders given me great satisfaction in the way he has carried out his famine and ordinary taluq work. The Overseer gets up his Estimates very carefully and is a first-rate draughtsman. I consider that Mr Court well deserves promotion to Overseer 2nd Grade.

Hospett Range Office
1st December 1878

(Signd) W. B. Christie

Executive Engineer.

—— D. ——

Hospett 24th January 1880.

Mr C. E. Court, Overseer 2nd Grade. P.W.D.

has served over (10) ten years in the Department. The last year he has served under me and I am happy to be able to speak in the highest terms of his willingness to carry out all instructions. He is very intelligent, up in office work, a good draughtsman, inured to out-door work and a very good horseman. I take Mr Court to be a very good man for any thing.

(Signed) Thos Smither Captn.

Sub-Division Officer

—— E. ——

Hospett. 28 May 1880.

Mr Court.

Sir,

I have your Note of the 28th instant and have much pleasure in testifying that so far as I have seen you have always worked well, willingly and efficiently and it is much to your credit that you did so for so many years and during the famine in such a lonely place as Hurpanhully.

I had hoped by your transfer to Gooty to have retained your services in this Department; but the reductions ordered are on so large a scale. I shall be very glad to hear you have succeeded in getting a more permanent appointment.

I am, Sir,

Yours faithfully

(Signd) Jno: F. Fischer

Col: R. E.

(True Copies)

Chas. E. Court

late Overseer 2nd Grade

Nellore Division

P.W. Encl. 1 / 3301 / 82

No. 2078. C of 14th Novr 82 P.W.D.

Recd 23.5.82

To

Colonel R. H. Sankey. C.B; R.E.
Chief Engineer. P.W. Deptt.
Madras.

Sir,

I humbly beg to submit the following facts in connection with my unfortunate case for your favorable and just consideration, with the hope that you will be pleased to reconsider your decision in Memorandum, No. 629 C. of 14th March 1882, to the Superintending Engineer 2nd Circle.

2. With regard to my reduction from the 2nd to the 3rd grade in 1876, it was more the result of my misfortune than my fault as will be seen from a reference to the report of the District Engineer. Bellary. On the evening of the robbery, I arrived in camp suffering from a severe attack of fever and ague and consequently forgot to take the precaution of chaining up my Cash box as is usually done: the result was the robbery, and my subsequent reduction.

3 When Mr Rundall, the Superintending Engineer of the 2nd Circle was District Engineer of Bellary in 1878, he reported me to the Chief Engineer and I was reprimanded. On receipt of the reprimand I was perfectly astonished as, so far from expecting any such thing

thing. I was at the time counting on my promotion which was promised to me by Mr Leggatt, Mr Rundall's predecessor, in the preceding December. As I was not aware that I had given any cause for being reported, I addressed a letter of protest about the matter and was informed, in reply, that the District Engineer had sent in the report. What the charges against me were, I was entirely ignorant of.

4. The Executive Engineer under whom I was then serving, Mr W. B. Christie, in sending up my application for re-instatement in my former (2nd) grade, remarked in his Endorsement (Vide Appendix B), as follows:- "I shall be very glad if you can get him "re-instated in his former grade. Some time after my "arrival, Mr Court got reprimanded by the Chief En-"gineer for delay in submitting Estimates. I have not "however found him dilatory in this respect during "my tenure of office here". Within 9 months of the date of the Chief Engineer's reprimand I was restored to the 2nd grade. 17th February 1879. That I had been working hard and did not deserve being reported to the Chief by the District Engineer, the above Remark will shew; as also a testimonial granted me by the same Executive Engineer, on his departure shortly after.

5. With reference to the report of Lieut. Henderson, the Executive Engineer under whom I was last serving, I beg respectfully to state that it was utterly impossible for me to have afforded him satisfaction, as all I did was viewed with an eye of prejudice by that Officer. That I had made good progress in carrying out the works under my charge the books of the Divisional Office will prove for the 2 years that I was in the Nellore Division. I was sent in July 1880 to take charge of 4 Taluqs in the North and to finish up the incomplete works there. I not only did so, but executed the works much within the estimated rates, notwithstanding the difficulties I had to contend with being a new man to the place and having my works 30 to 50 miles apart. I expended large balances on the Cyclone-destroyed tanks in the Kundukur Taluq to the end of March 1881. (Vide Expenditure on Works in this Taluq for the year 1880.81) every pie of which was expended by me. Besides this I spent a large sum in collecting Materials for, and construction departmentally, of the Sub Collector's House at Ongole; taking measurements, making bills for Contractors and payments to Coolies personally on this and other works, having no Clerk to assist me in any way. It was during this period, when overwhelmed with work in the 4 Taluqs, during the last 3 months of 1880.81, (for I was the only Overseer in the whole Division who had so extensive a charge), that the Executive Engineer conceived a prejudice against me, which I could not subsequently surmount and which has now resulted so disastrously.

6. Adverting to the Executive Engineer's vague and general charge that I showed, in no single instance, any desire to push on with my works and that I was completely wanting in energy, I beg respectfully, to state

that

that the Estimated Amount (Rs 7,300) for the Sub Collector's House, was expended in 10½ months; and for the Registry Office (Rs 2,200) in 8 months, and this notwithstanding the delays of the Contractor in supplying Materials. Had I twenty other Works going on at the same time in different parts of my charge, their progress, I submit, would have been uniform with these nor would they have impeded their execution; but as there were only two and both in a comparatively small town, where some kinds of skilled labor were not procurable, their progress might have appeared small individually and relatively. In fact, for about 2 months (July and August) I had no Maistry on the Works (the one who was in charge having been dismissed by order of the Executive Engineer) and during that time I had personally to attend to everything myself, in addition to my own duties, standing every day in the sun, to see the work being done, thereby forfeiting my Travelling Allowance in my earnest anxiety to push on the works in question.

7. With regard to the delay in replying to references, I beg to state that, in each case, I sent an explanation of the delay and that it was generally accepted at the time, or otherwise a report would have been made to the Supd. Engineer immediately. None was then made, but only now, after a lapse of some months and after the arrival of Mr. Rundall as Supd. Engineer in this Circle has a report been sent, urging no fresh instances of neglect, but cases which occurred months previously, under the incumbency of Col: H. L. Prendergast

R. E.

R. E. as Superintending Engineer and which on satisfactory explanation were deemed unworthy of notice during that Officer's incumbency. Since Mr. Rundall's arrival, however, some months later, these very instances have become unpardonable and considered worthy of being made the subject of a special report to the Chief Engineer. I may here explain that when the Executive Engineer came into my Taluq, at the beginning of February last, he stated that he had come with the set purpose of sending a report against me, having been ordered to do so by the Supd. Engineer and, as no fault could be found with the quality of my work, he overhauled my Office records and picked out all the references for which reminders were sent to me, to form the basis of the special report required.

8. I further beg to state that I could not send in any Estimates, for tank repairs, as no paper was supplied to me when indented for in October 1881, and on a reminder being sent, the paper was forwarded after a further delay, followed almost immediately by an Order directing me not to leave Head Quarters, without written instructions to do so, thereby precluding me from all possibility of preparing and sending up the required Estimates. The Executive Engineer, in his report, says that I wrote, that during my absence from Head Quarters, the two works in progress there had to be stopped, and that he was therefore obliged to order me not to leave my Head Quarters. In my explanation, I denied *in toto* that

I

No. 2078. C 14 Nov/82 P.W.D.

I had written such a frivolous excuse and do so even now as I have no recollection either of ever having penned or attached my signature to any such document. The Executive Engineer has all along dealt very hard with me as will be apparent from the facts set forth. His prejudice against me led him so far as to censure me for what was, in one case, beyond my control and, in another, he threatened to suspend me if I failed to send in any explanation about certain "Materials at Site" on two works, of which I knew nothing, although Mr Laskey, Sub Engineer who was in charge of the Division 5 or 6 months previously and who was therefore the proper person to apply to for this information, was still in the Division.

9. I beg respectfully to submit that, since the reprimand by the Chief Engineer in 1878, I have afforded satisfaction to all the Officers under whom I served as will be proved by the fact of my having been promoted within 9 months thereafter, as also from a perusal of my testimonials (Vide Appendices) and I further beg to submit that had I been considered so bad as I have been represented to you by the Supg. and Executive Engineers, I certainly would have been removed from the Department when the extensive reductions took place in 1880 and when the Department was literally weeded. At that time I was in the Bellary District and my name was among those whose services were to be retained and Lt. Col. H. L. Prendergast. R. E. Supg. Engr. 1st Circle, can testify if referred to, as to the way I conducted myself when in the Bellary Division.

10. I therefore humbly beg that you will be pleased on review to take my case once more into consideration as it is very hard that I should lose my appointment after 14 3/4 years faithful service (of which 12 3/4 years count towards pension) merely because I unfortunately happened to displease the Executive Engineer under whom I was last serving. I am compelled so far to intrude, by necessity, on your time and patience, as ~~by~~ the loss of my post at my age (35 years) burdened with a family is a great calamity. I am precluded from getting any other post under Government; my age being over 25 years and will consequently have to commence life anew, in competition with younger and stronger men, with a constitution which is somewhat impaired by exposure and privations for over 10 years in one of the most unhealthy taluqs in the Bellary District.

11. Under these distressing circumstances I beg to appeal to your justice and mercy, trusting that in consideration of the good testimonials I hold from other Officers under whom I have served and my long and faithful service you will be pleased to give me an opportunity of retrieving my position and character unfortunately lost by me by service under the Executive Engineer, Nellore Division.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your very Obedient Servant
Chas. Wo. Court.
Late Overseer. 2nd Grade. P.W.D.
Nellore Division.

Madras
22nd May 1882

C.E. No 629 C- 14-3-82.

P.W.C. No 3301

Recd 23 May/82

Encl. 1

Memo No 184 E a/ 1st June /82.

After a review of the circumstances brought forward, the Chief Engineer is unable to see any reason to reconsider his decision in Mr Court's case.

(S) J.B. caw_ (Sd) R.H. Sankey Col. R.E.
Chf Engr. P.W.D.

To, Mr C.E. Court
late Overseer, P.W.D. - Dated 1.6.82

O.L.S. 45/5

ool 26/5

From
Mr C. E. Court
(late Overseer 2d grade- Nellore)
Madras.-

To
The Chief Engineer P.W.D.
Madras.-

Sir,

With reference to your No 184 E, of 1st June 1882, I humbly beg you will be pleased, in consideration of the circumstances adduced in my letter of appeal dated 22d May 1882, to allow me at least the indulgence of resigning my appointment as an Overseer in the P.W.D. from the date of my relief - the 3rd of March 1882 - as I find great difficulty in obtaining a post in any other Department under Government, by reason of the Stigma that attaches to the fact that my services were dispensed with in the P.W. Department.-

I am with great reluctance, led to be so importunate, as I have a wife and children dependant on me, and I therefore humbly beg you will be pleased to confer on me the privelige I crave, which, though in itself, a small thing to grant, will be received by me and my unfortunate family as an inestimable boon and a special act of grace.-

I humbly beg in conclusion to solicit your pardon for once more intruding on your valuable time - my necessity

alone

P.W.C No 7647

Recd. 7/11/82

Return with previous papers

7-11-82 - Jls

~~To a/cW~~ to the file R.S. 7-11

Late Overseer, P.W.D. –

No 2078 C of 14 Nov/82 P.W.D.

Memorandum

Petition from Mr C.E. Court late overseer P.W.D.

H.E. No — of 6th October/82

Seeing that Mr Court has not been guilty of any fraudulent act, the Chief Engineer is pleased on ~~recommendation~~ reconsideration, to cancel the dismissal ordered in Order No 629C of 14th March 1882, and to accept Mr Court's resignation of his appointment in the P.W. Dept:

2. Mr Court will regard this Concession entirely as an act of grace, not called for by the Circumstances of his Conduct which merit the penalty of dismissal previously accorded.

3. No further appeals to this office can be attended to.

RM

13.11.82

To Mr C.E. Court.
The Supt.g: Engineer Second Circle
" Examiner P.W. Accts:

Despd 16-11-82 - R.S.

D.W.

184 E of 1·6·82
629 C of 14·3·82

R No 686 of 82

RW file 4995/82

No 2078 C of 14-11-82

E

C.E. 6/11

Office of the Supdt. ~~Engineer~~ of Works,
Tank Maintenance Scheme,

No. 1012 T

Chepauk, 6th June 1884

From

The SUPERINTENDENT ~~ENGINEER~~ of Works,
Tank Maintenance Scheme,

To

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation

Enclosures.

Sir,

I have the honor to report for the information of the Chief Engineer that Mr. C. E. Court, Local Fund Overseer, Gudivada, Kistna District, has been appointed as a temporary Overseer, instead of V. P. Ramasawmy Iyer, & posted to No. 1 Tanks Divn.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obdt. servt.,
Jno Pennycuick
Lieut Col R.E.
Supdt of Works
T. M. Scheme

6. No. 50 E.W.

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer P.W. Department.

Chepauk
9th June 84.
despd 10/6

Lt Col. RE.

To Chief Engineer for Irrigation
Chepauk

No. 1080 D
To S. E. T. 13th June/84

Were you aware, when confirming Mr Court's temporary appointment, that he was dismissed from the P.W. Deptt in March 1882, the dismissal having been afterwards commuted to resignation "as an act of grace"?

The enclosed papers on the subject are forwarded for perusal & return.

CY

12.6

Cy/

acty 17/6/84 R 21/6/84

R No 685 of 84 1884.

CHIEF ENGINEER
7 JUN 1884
IRRIGATION

7

R 45-7

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
Tank Maintenance Scheme,

To

THE Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No. 1012 T
Dated 6th June 1884
Despatched —— Do ——
Received 10 " "

ENCLOSURES.

No: 1583 W d/24th June/84

Subject.

Reports that Mr C. E. Court, Local Fund Overseer, Gudivada, Kistna Distd, has been appointed tempy Overseer instead of V. P. Ramaswamy Iyer, & posted to No. 1 Tank Divn

70

No. 1054 T

D.W 13th June/84

No — I certainly was not aware of Mr Court's dismissal, nor do I think Col. Montgomerie, by whom the appointment was made, was aware of it either —

As however the appointment has been made it would perhaps be unduly harsh to cancel it, and I shall be glad if W. can see his way to confirming it —

I will take care ~~that~~ he is closely watched, and ~~that~~ he is warned ~~that~~ if he neglects this opportunity of retrieving his character he will not get another —

Papers returned herewith —

D 13.6

No: 629C d/14-3-82
" 1848 d/ 1-6-82
" 2078C d/14-11-82
" 1080D d/13-6-84

Dtd No 4/5

Rev 14/6/84

En 1 & 1 file

No: 1583 W d/24th June /84

O.G.S. 70/6.

actg 17/6/84 R 21/6/84

No: 1583 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

(26)

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 24th June 1884

READ the following

From the Supdt of Works Tank Maintenance	H.E. No. 1012. P. d/ 6th June 1884
Endorsement of the Chief Engr for Irrign	H.E. No. 50 E W d/ 9th June
Office Note from the Supdt of Works Tank Maintenance	H.E. No. 1654 P. d/13 "

The appointment of Mr. C E Court, as temporary Overseer on Rs. 80 per mensem in No. I Tank division, is approved.

CJ
16.6.84

19.6.84

D 24/6

To The Supdt of Works T.M.
Ex PW A
" Chief Engr for Irrign

11-9-93

From the Supdt. of Tank Maintenance

B

No: 1583 W d/24th June 1884

M. 24.6

E/ue 26/6

Wr 25/6

Id 26/6

ooty 17/6/84

Sent in Reqd Regtr

ooty 26/5

P. W. 1884 DEPARTMENT.

No. 484

From The Chief Engr for

No. 50 E. W.
Dated 9-6-84
Recd. 10-6-84

E

M. 23/6

SUBJECT.

Forwarding letter from the S. E. Tank Maintenance repor that Mr. C. E. Court, L. F. Overs Gudiwada has been appointed tem overseer & posted to No: 1 Tank Divn

Disposal.

No. 1080 D d/13th June /84

To
S. E. T.

Were you aware, when confirming Mr. Court's tempy appointt, that he was dismissed from the P. W. Deptt in March 1882, the dismissal having been afterwards commuted to resignation "as an act of grace"?

The enclosed papers on the subject are forwarded for perusal & return

Jos C. B.
D. W

No. 2078 Ca/ 14-11-82
" 1848 ca/ 1-6-82
" 629 Ca/ 14-3-82

Sent with the O.N
to S.E. 7
12/6-

4844

D.W.

Mr Court was dismissed from the P.W.D. in March 1882 –

In November of the same year. the dismissal was commuted to resignation.

For orders. whether the action of the S.W. Tank Scheme shall be confirmed.

Mr Court's present employment will be in a temporary capacity only.

C.L.
10/6/[illegible]

I think S.E. Trunk Maintenance might be asked if he was aware, when conferring the temp^y appointment, that M^r Court was dismissed from the Dep^{tmt} in March 82, the dismissal being afterwards commuted to resignation "as an act of grace" –

C.S.
11–6–84