



To

COLONEL J. O. HASTED, R. E.,

Secretary to Government, Public Works Department,

MADRAS.

The humble Petition of N. VIRARAGAVIA
PUNTULU, late Supervisor, D. P. W.,
1st Grade, attached to Rajamundry
Sub-Division, 1st Circle.

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

That your Petitioner entered the D. P. W. as an Overseer, in 1870, and served for 15 years, in the course of which he was promoted to the rank of Supervisor, having been in the 1st Grade for 4 years; and that during the greater portion of his service he was in charge of several Sub-divisions, in which capacity he was entrusted with many important and responsible works, all of which he executed faithfully and satisfactorily. Petitioner was summarily dismissed under Chief Engineer's Memorandum, No. 2210 of 22nd December, 1885, whereby he was informed that the grounds of his dismissal were;—

- (1) Exceeding allotments of works in his Sub-division and incurring liabilities;
and,
- (2) Permitting irregularities in his accounts.

The first point to which Petitioner craves your kind consideration is that until he received the order of dismissal he was unaware what the charges against him were, and he was therefore utterly precluded from submitting any explanation whatever, beyond what was suggested to him in the anxiety and confusion of mind resulting from his having been suspended and having had no data whatever to go upon. With regard to the charges brought against him, Petitioner begs to submit that the first of them is in reality no charge at all. On the contrary, when viewed in the light of attendant circumstances and of the detailed explanation submitted hereunder, so far from disclosing any dereliction of duty on his part, it will only go to show that Petitioner simply acted in good faith and in the public interests by pushing forward and completing works so as to gain credit.

The obtaining and adjusting of allotments was a matter for which Petitioner could not be held responsible, since all that he could have done, and, which he actually did, was to keep his superior officer duly informed from time to time as to the quantity of work executed and the funds needed for the same. As to the second charge, Petitioner deferentially begs to submit "the irregularities" therein referred to are by no means of a serious character, while

it will be perfectly evident from the subjoined explanation that Petitioner was in no way to be blamed for them; and that they took place under such peculiar circumstances that they could not but have occurred. These charges, Petitioner further ventures to submit, are certainly not so grave as to justify the infliction of so severe punishment as that of dismissal, especially in the case of Petitioner's rank and long and good service. The peculiar harshness of the said order will be all the more apparent when it is remembered that it was passed before hearing Petitioner in his defence, and without giving him any opportunity whatever of offering a complete explanation.

II. That the first intimation which Petitioner received as to there being anything against him, was a letter from the Executive Engineer, dated 12th September, 1885, in which Petitioner was informed that he was suspended from that date. Immediately on receipt of this letter, Petitioner accordingly gave overcharge of his office; and having come to know, while awaiting further instructions from the Executive Engineer, that his case had been forwarded to the Chief Engineer for orders, Petitioner forthwith prepared and sent up his hasty petition of 8th October, 1885, which was followed by another on the 20th November, 1885. These petitions, as already stated, were exceedingly imperfect, and therefore could not, as they did not, carry any weight, inasmuch as they were drawn up in total ignorance as to the nature of the charges brought against Petitioner. Now that he has been furnished by the Chief Engineer's Memorandum, already referred to above, with details regarding his case, Petitioner most respectfully begs to submit this petition for favourable consideration.

III. That the charges preferred against the Petitioner in the Memorandum under reference are as follow:—

- (1) "Exceeding the allotments for works in his Sub-division by Rs. 7,462, and incurring liabilities amounting to Rs. 10,472 (since reduced to Rs. 9,542)." In explanation of this, Petitioner, most respectfully submits the following facts:—

The excess expenditure in question was incurred not only in the interests of very important and urgent works, but also in accordance with the express orders of the Executive Engineer, as will appear from the following circumstances:—About the end of August, 1884, Petitioner brought to the notice of the Executive Engineer that about 3 miles of the Godavery left embankment, near its north end, was in a precarious condition, as had then been frequently reported by the Revenue authorities; and having obtained that officer's orders to proceed with the work to the extent of the then available balance, the work was put in hand about the end of October, 1884.

On the 30th of that month, Petitioner wrote* to the Executive Engineer, informing

Annexure A.
* No. 359.
From THE SUPERVISOR,
In charge of Rajamundry,
Sub-Division.
To THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
In charge of East-Division,
Godavery District.

SIR,
I beg to inform that the work for Godavery Left Embankment, at its North end, close to Pooroo-shotapatnam-hill has been commenced, and its extent has been so adjusted as to confine it to the allotment of the current year 1884-85.
2. There are, at present, about 600 buntadars collected, and the work now apportioned to them is hardly enough to keep them going even for 10 days. There would be still about 2½ miles of the embankment, at this end, to be raised, and about a mile of it to be widened in mile 8 at Katavaram. Should the work above referred to be completed, the embankment work might be considered to have

him that the embankment work had been started for half a mile to keep it within the then available balance, Rs. 2,500, and suggesting that as more than six hundred workmen were then available, and as the season was very favourable for the particular kind of work (turking, &c.,) he might be permitted to push on and complete the embankment work to the full extent of the remaining 2½ miles, arranging to pay for such work as might be done in excess of the then available balance after the commencement of the ensuing official year 1885-86; an arrangement to which, Petitioner also stated, the labourers were agreeable. A kind perusal of Annexure A will show that Petitioner duly brought to notice the necessity for confining his expenditure to the current balance of allotment, but asked the permission of the

been finished, and as a whole host of buntadars will have to disperse for want of work, I venture to ask you, simply for the progress of the work, whether I may not put on the buntadars to complete the earth-work and turking, on condition of paying for their work when money shall be allotted, say in 3 or 4 months hence, as many of them are willing to undertake the work. The main reason for my urging the above is that turking can be conveniently done now; whereas, if this opportunity be missed, proper time for turking in future will be the ensuing August or so. Please favor me with your opinion.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Sd.) N. VIRARAGAVIA,
Supervisor, D. P. W.

Annexure B.

* Endorsement on letter No. 359, dated 30/10/84.
No. 251 of 2nd Nov., 1884.

To THE SUB-DIVISION OFFICER,
Rajamundry.
You will do work to the extent of allotment, measure it up and pay for it. Any other work you do cannot be paid for until after 1st April, 1885.
(Signed) C. C. RAWSON,
Executive Engineer,
East. Dn., G. Dist.

Executive Engineer to complete the 2½ miles of the embankment with the then available labour, which was represented to have been capable of turning out work costing about Rs. 2,500 for every 10 days. Petitioner's suggestion was approved of by the Executive Engineer, as is evident from his endorsement* No. 251, dated 2nd November, 1884. On the strength of this endorsement, Petitioner proceeded with the work in question, which was completed about the end of December, 1884, the progress of the same having been duly reported from time to time to the Executive Engineer in the monthly Progress Report of works, ten-day reports and journals of Petitioner during the months of November and December, 1884. Petitioner begs to submit that it is perfectly clear, from Annexure A, (a special and careful perusal of which he craves), that he fully realized the fact of his being bound to keep within the then available balance for 1884; and that it was only in his anxiety for the due and timely completion of the remaining 2½ miles, in that favourable season, and with the labour then so easily available, that he requested the special orders of the Executive Engineer to push on and complete the embankment in anticipation of the ensuing year's allotment. It is also clear from the Executive Engineer's endorsement (Annexure B.) when read, as it must be, in the light of Petitioner's letter, to which it was a reply, that the officer did actually accord sanction for completing 2½ miles of the embankment work in question out of a long-standing and sanctioned estimate on the only condition of deferring its payment till the ensuing official year 1885-86. Petitioner would here beg to point out that necessary steps should have been taken in preparing the Divisional Budget Estimate for 1885-86 to obtain sufficient allotments so as to cover the liability thus incurred with good motive and under sufficient authority. As Petitioner had nothing to do with the taking of these steps, he simply waited until the commencement of the official year 1885-86, when he proceeded to fulfil the arrangements he had made with the contractors, and paid them for the work they did in the past year. A reference to the Rajamundry Sub-divisional office letter book for April, 1885, (which Petitioner specially requests may be looked into), will show, that having made payments to the contractors, Petitioner duly reported the circumstances to the Executive Engineer, pointing out that the provision in the preliminary budget Rs. 9,000 had been exceeded, for work done under orders, and requesting him to arrange for obtaining additional funds. These funds could have even been obtained, on timely representation to Government, in the "Statement of Demands for Incomplete Works" of 1884-85, and the difficulty in question could have been easily got over; but this attempt does not appear to have been made. In the absence of this attempt, the Government in their subsequent retrenchment order reduced the budget grant of Rs. 9,000 to Rs. 6,500. This is a clear proof that the Government were not aware of the fact that the embankment work has been completed in the previous official year, and that large liabilities existed for work already done. Petitioner here begs to point out that no work whatever was done for the embankment in 1885-86, and no payments consequently were made for such work in excess of allotment; all the payments made in connection with the work of embankment were for what had been done prior to December, 1884.

It seems exceedingly difficult to reconcile these facts with the statement that "Petitioner was repeatedly warned;" and as a matter of fact, the first so-called warning is dated 14th May, 1885, which was nearly 5 months after the work had been completed, and one month after payments had actually been made.

IV. That in connection with the excess under I. and N. Works, Petitioner begs to state that the facts are as follows:—

About the close of the year 1884, when the balance available for works was Rs. 2,500, certain sanctioned emergent and incomplete repairs (anicut of hill streams) had to be completed, and their completion cost Rs. 11,650, which was duly reported to the Executive Engineer by Petitioner in the latter's letter No. 306, dated 30th October, 1884. On the strength of the Executive Engineer's endorsement thereon (*Annexure C.) Petitioner applied for Rs. 7,000 on the 11th November, 1884, and again for Rs. 10,060 on the 5th December, 1884. No reply was ever received by the Petitioner to the first of these applications; while an endorsement on the second was received about the end of December, 1884, to the following effect, "Do not exceed your allotment, and no more applications will be sent for the difference of the sums asked for as the application might be refused." Thus in the absence of additional allotment, the expenditure incurred in anticipation of sanction and in accordance with orders, had to be carried on to the next official year, (1885-86). Petitioner would here also beg to point out that since the

***Annexure C.**

Endorsement on the Supervisor's letter No. 360, 30/10/84.
No. 256.

To THE SUB-DIVISIONAL OFFICER,
Rajamundry.
The outstanding balance is Rs. 2,500. If more sums are necessary it should be reported at once in order that an application may be submitted for sanction.

(Sd.) C. C. RAWSON, CAPTAIN, R. E.,
Executive Engineer,
East Dn., Godavery Dt.
RAJAMUNDRY,
7th November, 1884. }

expenditure above referred to was known 3 full months prior to the submission of the Budget Estimate for 1885-86, and since there did not then exist scarcity of funds, sufficient provision should have been made, not only to cover the extra expenditure already incurred under orders, and therefore a known liability, but also to meet the usual requirements of that official year. This was not done; and the excess expenditure and liabilities therefore arose from the fact of the Budget Estimates having been calculated far below the actual requirements. From the circumstances just set forth, it will be evident that the payments made in 1885-86, under the head of I. and N. Works, were mostly on account of work done during the preceding official year, and against allotments procured for the actual requirements of that official year. In connection with these works, too, Petitioner most respectfully begs to point out that the first intimation he received as to keeping within allotments was the Executive Engineer's endorsement, dated 18th June, 1885, and that this was after the works had been mostly finished and payments mostly made. Petitioner would further urge that those payments made by him which are now spoken of as exceeding allotments were really within the budget allotments, and that the so-called "excess" was simply the result of a subsequent reduction of grants, a reduction which, under the circumstances now set forth, must be inferred to have been made without full knowledge and consideration of the real facts of the case.

It seems, therefore, exceedingly difficult to explain or understand how, as stated in paragraph 4 of Chief Engineer's Memorandum, now under notice, Petitioner could have been "repeatedly warned not to exceed allotments." The first intimation on the subject which Petitioner received from the Executive Engineer was under date 18th June, 1885, and was simply an endorsement on the retrenchment order of the Government of India, then just issued; but this, Petitioner submits, cannot be regarded as a "warning," since, as already stated, payments had already been mostly made and liabilities already mostly incurred. With reference to the statement of the Executive Engineer, (also referred to in para. 4 of Chief Engineer's Memorandum), that Petitioner "was kept informed of the available grant for the different works," Petitioner humbly states that, as will be seen from his letters (Annexures

D. & E)* to the Executive Engineer, even after the receipt of the intimation not to exceed

***Annexure D.**

No. 131.

2nd July, 1885.
RAJAMUNDRY.

From

THE SUPERVISOR,
In charge of Rajamundry,
Sub-Division.

To

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
In charge of Eastern Division,
Godavery District.

SIR,

In acknowledging the receipt of your Memo. No. 81, 21st July, 1885, received in this office on the 30th June, 1885, but seen by me this day, I beg to be informed with the actual balance on—

(a) I. and N. New works;

(b) Do. Repairs;

up to the end of May, 1885, as I have no definite idea of what it is.

2. As has been usual hitherto, I put in hand all the sanctioned works under the above two heads, as till very lately I had no orders whatever to stop them, not to commence them or confine myself within the current year's allotment, on the above two heads. Of course the original allotments under the above two heads were communicated to me, but at the same time certain heavy estimates were sanctioned with orders to execute them at once, ordering personally also, as usual, to push on with them. I have hitherto been commencing and executing all the sanctioned works, under orders, unmindful of allotments, as per your personal orders; and in case of my having exceeded allotments, you used to have the extra expenditure adjusted either by obtaining additional allotment or in some other way.

3. I beg to say that in having commenced at present all the sanctioned works, I did but follow the usual course; and till now there existed no stringent orders to curtail expenditure.

4. The above sanctioned works were commenced long ago, and almost all of them are on the verge of completion. It is not at all practicable to stop them now abruptly, as by so doing some of the incomplete works will have to suffer. About two works under 'new works' may be stopped, but not under repairs.

5. As I am uneasy as to what to do, I very much entreat you to favor me with instructions at your earliest convenience. As has been hitherto done in several cases, payments may be limited to balances of current year's allotment, and the remaining dues may be paid on receipt of new allotments. Kindly favor me with instructions.

6. Since your orders are very stringent, I have, in obedience to them, issued orders, on this very day to stop all works, just as they are up to, date, till I go round to inspect them, measure them and see whether there will be left any surplus of balance to complete any of them. I fear it is already too late with regard to 'repairs', as I stated above they must suffer by stopping them abruptly without bringing them to any shape or size.

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Sd.) N. VIRARAGAVIA,
Supervisor, D. P. W.

allotments, Petitioner was kept quite ignorant of the amounts of the balance then available, and that he had actually to go in person to the Executive Engineer's office to obtain information on the point. Petitioner begs to state that information as to available balances could be had in divisional office alone, where complete accounts (Work-Abstract, &c.,) are maintained. It will also be clear, that directly he was told not to exceed allotments, he stopped work, and deferred payments to the utmost extent then practicable. Thus it will be seen that in incurring excess expenditure and liabilities he was acting not only in strict accordance with the orders (both personal and written) of his immediate superior, but also acting in the best interests of the works under his charge; and that the unfortunate circumstances that allotments were exceeded and liabilities incurred were simply and solely owing to the unexpected receipt of an order from the Government of India which rendered retrenchment compulsory, and to the omission on the part of those who prepared the Budget Estimates for 1885-86, in the Executive Engineer's office, to make due provision for the then known liabilities.

V. That with regard to the 2nd heading of charges against Petitioner, "Permitting grave irregularities in his accounts," he begs to submit:—

(a) "Keeping his private money with the public cash in direct contravention of para. 1931 of P. W. Code."

In explanation of the above, Petitioner begs to state that what was stated in the charge took place on but one single and trifling occasion, and would not have occurred even then were it not that when he had to make an urgent payment, while absent from head-quarters, in the beginning of August, 1885, and was unable to obtain small coins from the Treasury, Petitioner used small coins from his private cash for Rupees 6-14-0, which in the press and hurry of work he forgot to reimburse himself with. Unfortunately there was, just at that time, a mistake in the cash-book of exactly Rupees 6-14-0, caused by Petitioner's clerk omitting to debit that amount which had been realized from grass sales, and duly remitted to the Treasury,—it was thus that the error escaped detection. The above mistake was not detected till the beginning of the following month, when the debit entry was made. It will thus be clear that Petitioner was unavoidably forced to mix up a small

Annexure E.

No. 142. 9th July, 1885,
RAJAMUNDRY.
From THE SUPERVISOR,
In charge of Rajamundry,
Sub-division.
To THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
In charge of East-Division,
Godavery District.

SIR,

In returning herewith your rescript No. 90, dated 4th April, 1885, I beg to inform that I stopped all works in this Sub-division, and I shall not pay hereafter for the I. and N. Works

(1) Original Works } in excess of allotments.
(2) Repairs, }

2. I went yesterday to the Divisional Office and ascertained the extent of the available balance of allotments under the above two heads.

Under 'Repairs,' Rs. 2,500 are available up to end of June, 1885, but under 'new works' there is already a small excess.

3. As soon as measurements of works can be finished I shall submit a list of liabilities up to the date of their stoppage. The works were put in hand, as I little expected the curtailing of allotments. I beg to say that payments will have to be made for the liabilities when new allotments become available.

I beg to remain, Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Sd.) N. VIRARAGAVIA,
Supervisor, D.P.W.

As to this charge, Petitioner begs to state that para. 2106 of the P. W. Code provides that "For large works, a separate measurement book *might be set apart*, or if found convenient, even two or more books may be set apart for different classes of works." This rule of the department, it will be seen, does not render it *compulsory* on any officer to keep a separate measurement book for every work, and much less so for estimates of one item, that is, of earth work. Petitioner was in the habit of keeping only one measurement book at a time in which the measurements of the various works under his charge were duly recorded from time to time, under their respective headings. This has been the Petitioner's practice ever since his entertainment in the department, and it has never been objected to or considered irregular by any of the officers under whom he served. Even Captain C. C. Rawson himself, who frequently examined Petitioner's measurement books in the course of the two years and more during which Petitioner served under him, never objected to the way in which the said books were kept, except on the occasion under notice, when the matter was brought to his notice by the Accountant to whom the examination of Sub-divisional records was entrusted. As, moreover, the particular manner in which measurement books are kept is merely a *matter of convenience* and is clearly left optional by the Code, Petitioner humbly submits that he is not to blame for the way in which he recorded measurements, seeing that his method of doing so had never been objected to.

(d.) "Failing to prepare separate bills for each buntadar, to whom money was paid."

As to this, Petitioner begs to state that the only object he had in 'clubbing' the bills of buntadars was simply to expedite and facilitate public business. He frequently had several thousands of workmen under him at a time, when there would be four to five-hundred headmen to whom payments would have to be made. Petitioner need not explain to one *with any practical knowledge and experience of the department*, that to have gone on making, every now and then, bills in the names of each individual headman, would have involved an enormous loss of time and labour. From the fact, moreover, that there were no complaints as to the distribution of money,

portion of his private money with the public cash, and that he did so *not with any deliberate intention of contravening the standing orders on the subject or with any fraudulent motive, but simply in order to meet the exigencies of the works under his charge.*

(b) "Keeping his cash-book very carelessly, mis-dating entries, and making entries in wrong places."

This was simply due to the inefficiency of Petitioner's temporary 2nd clerk, who having made certain incorrect entries, obliged the Petitioner to strike out a small portion of the cash-book and get it re-written. So far, therefore, from showing "carelessness," it reflects just the other way upon Petitioner; while it has also to be borne in mind that at the time these mistakes in the cash-book occurred Petitioner was left with only the temporary and inefficient 2nd clerk, (the permanent clerk having been called away to bring up arrears in divisional office) who was never theretofore entrusted with writing up the cash-book, although it is true that he had been "Working in the Sub-division for the past five years."

(c) "Failing to keep separate measurement books for important works."

it will be clear that the clubbing of bills by Petitioner was not resorted to with any improper motive. The mere circumstance, therefore, of Petitioner having clubbed buntadars bills cannot form a *serious* or any charge against him.

VI. That with reference to the statement in paragraph 3 of Chief Engineer's Memorandum under appeal, that "Petitioner submitted an erroneous cash balance statement with a false certificate" at the end of May, 1884, he most humbly begs to lay the following facts before you. In preparing an extract from the Sub-divisional cash-book, for May, 1884, a total Rupees 2,205-4-11 at the bottom of one page was erroneously carried forward by the clerk to the following page as Rupees 2,025-4-11; and this mistake struck for that month. This mistake was subsequently discovered by Petitioner himself, and immediately reported to the Executive Engineer, which circumstance, although it lead to Petitioner's being "reprimanded," clearly shows that he had no fraudulent intention whatever. Petitioner begs to state further, that at the time when the above mistake occurred, he was so very busy in carrying out emergent works departmentally, and his attention was so entirely absorbed with field work that it was absolutely impossible for him to look after the accounts of his office, as carefully and minutely as was his wont. Petitioner would also respectfully represent that when he signed the cash balance statement in question he was unable to ascertain by actual counting what monies he had then with him; for, as will appear from a reference to his journal, (for May, 1884), he was then on circuit, and his cash-chest was in the Camp Office at Torrigadda,—Petitioner having signed the cash balance statement at Rajamundry, through which place he was passing on his way from Dowalaishweram, whither he had been to consult urgently with the Quarry Officer. Thus it will be evident that the submission of what proved to be an erroneous cash balance statement was *simply the result* of Petitioner having been over-burdened with work, and having under such pressure depended too much on the accuracy of his clerk.

VII. That with reference to the statement in paragraph 6 of Chief Engineer's Memorandum above quoted, that "In 1876, he was transferred from the Gumsur Sub-division (Ganjam) to the South Arcot District on account of incapacity," Petitioner would *differentially* point out that this is not in keeping with the terms of the transfer order. The said transfer was simply effected at Petitioner's own request, and owing to his ill-health supported by a Medical Certificate. There was not, therefore, and could not possibly have been, any remark as to "Incapacity," or otherwise in the transfer order; although it is just possible that Mr. T. D. Harris, then District Engineer, (between whom and Petitioner there was a long-standing ill-feeling, owing to Mr. T. D. Harris having once used bad language to the Petitioner in official correspondence) might have stated something of the kind in his demi-official communications with a view to injure Petitioner. A reference to the records of the Ganjam District Engineer's Office, for about the middle of 1874, will, Petitioner begs to urge, show that there really was ill-feeling between Mr. T. D. Harris and Petitioner, so that any unfavourable remarks by that officer against Petitioner cannot be regarded as quite correct, especially when it is seen that Petitioner was always highly spoken of by all the other officers under whom he served.

VIII. That as to Petitioner's having been reduced to the 2nd grade (as also referred to in paragraph 6 of the above memorandum) under Chief Engineer's Memo. No. 530-C of 3rd March, 1883, he submits that the fact of his having been restored to the 1st grade within a year from such reduction is ample evidence that he had fully atoned for whatever "Neglect of duty," he might have been guilty of, while, in the said memorandum itself, he was distinctly absolved from any participation in fraud. Similarly as to the statement "He got into trouble soon after he joined the department, and was removed from it, but was restored by G. O. No. 1930, dated 13th August, 1870", it certainly seems very hard that these long past episodes should now be raked up against Petitioner and actually be made *one of the grounds* whereon he has been dealt the extreme penalty of dismissal from the department where he has served long, faithfully and actively.

IX. That Petitioner most respectfully prays that you would be pleased to give special weight to the circumstances of his long and faithful service in the department for a period of over 15 years, for the last 2½ years of which, when in charge of the Rajamundry Sub-division, he executed various important works (as per margin*) satisfactorily. Should

reference be kindly made to the records of the said Sub-division for the above period, it will be seen that the cost of works executed by Petitioner for the most part departmentally, amounted to Rs. 65,000 in 1884, and nearly Rs. 1,00,000 in 1885, apart from the tedious preparation and submission of Tank repair Estimates, (complete with drawings, &c.,) also completed by him to the extent of about Rs. 1,00,000. It is not neces-

sary, Petitioner feels, in addressing one who possesses the vast and varied experience of the officer now presiding over the P. W. D., to state that the above-mentioned facts do convincingly show that Petitioner must have taken very great pains indeed to achieve the results which he did, especially when it is borne in mind that (throughout the period of his charge of the Rajamundry Sub-division) he was assisted by only one Overseer. Your particular attention is also humbly requested to the quarterly and half-yearly qualification Reports (filed in Chief Engineer's Office) for the period of Petitioner's service, as it will therefrom be evident that the truth of the above-mentioned facts is borne out by several able and experienced officers, who have also testified to Petitioner's care, capability and integrity as a public servant.

X.—That it has also to be borne in mind, Petitioner begs to submit, that the excess and liabilities with which he is charged for having incurred were simply and solely caused by the Financial crisis of 1885-86, and in consequence of which all officers were suddenly called upon to retrench; and it was thus and thus alone that occasion was given for excess expenditure, and certainly not, at any rate in Petitioner's case, owing to any mistake on the part of the subordinate executive agency. As to the *irregularities in accounts*, Petitioner has already ventured to show that in the first place they were by no means of a serious character; and he now begs to urge that, such as they were, they were merely brought up by the Divisional Accountant, who evidently did not bear in mind that such minor errors as he detected were details of purely indoor work to which an official of Petitioner's status could hardly be expected

2 years, Gumsur Sub-division.
4 years, Kallakuruchi Sub-division.
2½ years, Rajamundry Sub-division.

to devote much attention. Even should it be assumed that Petitioner was directly to blame for the errors in question, he differentially submits that the said

mistakes are by no means of so grave a character as to justify the exceedingly severe and even ruinous punishment of dismissal which has been inflicted on him, when it is considered that Petitioner was made to work at the risk of his health in the marginally noted sub-divisions, notoriously bad for their malarious climate.

XI.—That in conclusion, Petitioner humbly and respectfully begs to state that having passed the better portion of his life in the D. P. W., working faithfully and to the best of his ability, he finds it exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for him now to resort to any other profession, while the order of dismissal precludes his obtaining a footing in any other department of the Public Service.

Petitioner has now been out of employment for upwards of a year and as he is burdened with a large family he has been, and is now suffering great distress and privations. In, therefore, casting himself finally on your mercy, Petitioner earnestly prays that you would be pleased to give his unfortunate case a careful and most favourable consideration and restore him to his appointment, on the ground that the distress and loss of position for upwards of a year may be considered a more than sufficient punishment for any error or indiscretion of which he may have been guilty.

And your Petitioner, as in duty bound,

WILL EVER PRAY.

17th MADRAS, November, 1886.

S. P. M. Pazawale
Puntulu.

N^o. 3137 W dated 26th Nov/86.
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Petition from N. Viraragavia Puntulu,
late Supervisor. P.W.D. praying for
restoration to his appointment.

After a careful
consideration of
the case the Govt.
see no reason for
modifying the
orders passed by
the Chief Engineer,
P.W.D. in his N^o.
2210.C. dated 22nd
December 1885.

W.C.B.
27. 11. 86

To the Petitioner,

Dec^r 26-11-86

File
22/11/86.

Case of Viraragavia
Puntulu late Super-
visor P.W.D.

Petitioner was dis-
missed the service
by the Chief Engr in
memo: No: 2210.C.
822.12.85 (to which
attention is invited)
and now appeals to
the Govt for restoration

The facts of the case
are fully set forth in
memo No: 2210.C.
above referred to, and
it will be seen from
Col: Shaw Stewart's note
dated 18.12.85 that
after going carefully
into the case he
could arrive at no
other conclusion

th

N^o. 530 C of 3.3.83
" 2021 C of 12.10.83
" 933 C of 1.5.84
" 2387 D of 20.10.85
" 2284 d of 28.8.76.
" 1745 C of 4.11.85
" 698 C of 22.2.86.
" 2210 C of 12.12.85
" 918 W of 3.4.86.

Am. 22.11.86.

L. 26.11.86

The Honorable

Mr. Foster Webster

No. 313710 dated 26th Nov. 1886

M.
26.11

Cur. 22.11.86.

D. A. M.

"than that the Super-visor must be removed from the Dept?"

It is not in this brief note proposed to go fully into the matter again, as the pros and cons are already distinctly set forth in the correspondence submitted.

In regard to the petition now under consideration -

It seems unnecessary to take more than passing notice of petitioner's assertions that "until he rec^d. the order of dismissal he was unaware of ~~the~~ what the

case the Govt. sees no reason for modifying the orders passed by the Ch. Secy. P. W. D. in his No. 2210.C. & 22.12.85."

The petitioner will no doubt submit a memorial to the Govt. of India or Secy. of State should his petition result in no good.

FB.

20.11.86.

W. B.

20.11.86.

The Requested order is approved.

Lam Ping Teen and two other
complain.

He
20/1/86.

charges against him
were and he was therefore
utterly ~~unable~~ precluded
from submitting any
Explanation whatever
beyond what was
suggested to him in
the "association & confusion
of mind" &c. The
Explanations subd.
by petitioner prior to
his dismissal were
sufficiently voluminous
and similar to those
now submitted to
render further con-
sideration of this
point unnecessary.

Petitioner refers to
his small and long
and good service.
Fifteen years is

not

Very long service nor
can the petitioners
record of service (vide
2210-C. He called good.

In regard to the
grounds on which
petitioner was dis-
missed it should
be stated that that
step was not taken
in consequence of any
one particular sin
committed by the
supervisor. but on
account of the many
charges against him
which he was unable
to satisfactorily explain
coupled with his
previous bad record.

7
The charge of exceeding
allotments was one
of many against the
~~former~~ Supervisor, and
the S. C. when re-
-porting on the case
said that the Super-
-visor was not sus-
-pended on that
account. His charge
is dealt with in para
4 of 2210.C. The
Supervisor's explanation
of the charge of irregu-
-larities in his accounts
appears to be similar
to that subdⁿ to the
Ch: Engr - disposed of
in para 5 of 2210.C.

Some