

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 32
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 21 செப்டம்பர் 90
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் கருக்கொப்பம் 10/1

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

செங்கப்பனத்தி துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	<u>2673</u>	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் : <u>10</u> - <u>10</u> - <u>1890</u>		<u>10/1</u>

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

16 செப்ட

ஆவண, கர-1-18,008-18-8-87.

Ramiah



Exhibit A

2673
1

No. 32

Dated 5 May 1890
Station - Big Bend a.

From

The Superintendent Engineer
Second Circle

To

The Executive Engineer
Kistna Eastern Division

Reference. En. Engr. No. 535 dated 1st Instant.

Cashier H. Ramiah is dismissed
for.

- (1) neglecting his work
- (2) absconding himself without leave on the plea of ill health &
- (3) for malingering as reported by the Civil apothecary in his letter no 64 of the 25th April 1890 to the Executive Engineer Kistna Eastern Division.

Signed J. Hannan
Supg. Engineer
H. Leister

1 True Cop.

687

From to H. Ramiah

10
to his quarters and found there was
nothing the matter with him. He is
in my opinion malingering -

I have the honor to be &

Yr.
Your most ob^l servant

(sd) Lawrence L R C P & S

Civil Apothecary
in Medical Charge

(True copy)

W. 10/6/90
Executive Engineer
E. D. K.

Subs 1/6/

Exhibit Dec 102
to 67

Buzunda 30 April 1870

From

2623

Q 9

The Civil ap^othecary
in medical Charge
Buzunda.

To
The Executive Engineer
Eastern Delta D. B.

Sir,

With reference to your letter
No 462 forwarding an outdoor
patient toicket 202077, I have
the honor to inform it was given
to K. Ramayya as his house name
was not known. He did not attend
the hospital on the morning of the
14th but I saw him near his place
at Buckinghamp^o. He did
not again attend the Hospital
till the 19th and then it appeared
to me he was not so ill as to
be attend the Hospital so as to
enable me to note his condition

On the 20th evening, I again
saw him and I could not
say there was anything the matter
with him then, although he wrote
to me saying he was very ill
I would die. He was granted
another ticket on the 21st morning
no 3114 on which it was not stated
that he was unfit, as he did
not attend the Hospital personally.
The former ticket was not produced
as the man whom he sent said
he did not give it to him.

I again did not see him
till after, I had sent you my
letter no 64, dated 25th April 1890
From these facts, the statement
that he was malingering was
inferred.

Yours &c

[Signed]

J. S. Lawrence
L. R. C. P. & S.E.
Civil & Apothecary
in Medical Charge.

1/2m Copy/

Dec 18/94

W. 2pp
Dec 18/94
Dec 18/94

TO

COLONEL J. PENNYCUICK, R. E.

CHIEF ENGINEER

& SECY: TO GOVT:

PUB: WORKS DEPT:

OOTACAMUND.

Most humbly sheweth

The humble appeal Petition of
K. Ramiah, late Cashier,
Kristna Eastern Division.

That your humble petitioner begs most respectfully to submit this, his appeal, against
the proceedings of the Superintending Engineer, 2nd Circle, approving of the recommendation
of the Ex: Engineer of Kristna, Eastern Division, to remove the petitioner from his office of
Cashier (Clerk IVth class, 3rd grade) on Rs. 30 per mensem for reasons explained below.

- (1) Neglect of work
- (2) Absence without leave
on the plea of ill health Vide Exhibit A.
- (3) Malingering

2. That your humble petitioner was not allowed an opportunity of explaining ^{himself} away the
charges brought against him, the specific charges not having been reduced to writing and his
explanation obtained; that thus the petitioner was deprived of one of the opportunities for
explaining his conduct, although the Code rules on the subject (vide Code para) require
most stringently such a procedure being adopted in all cases of dismissal. Petitioner was
called upon by the Ex: Engineer to submit an explanation regarding his absence on 5-5-90
and on the very date, the Ex: Engineer sent to petitioner a Memo No. 637 dated 5-5-90
(enclosed) to say that his explanation was not necessary, as the Superintending Engineer
has already approved of his (petitioner's) dismissal.

3. From the nature of the charges on which the dismissal of your petitioner was based
it will be apparent that they are too indefinite to be explained satisfactorily. Your petitioner
begs however to submit the following explanation which he trusts will be considered quite
satisfactory.

(1) Neglect of Work.

Vide Service book enclosed

This charge is so vague that no specific explanation can be submitted beyond that the petitioner has put in about 8½ years' service during which period he has earned all the increments of his grade which means that his services were approved by the Officers under whom he served; your petitioner has been fortunate enough to deserve the kind approbation of his services by all the Ex: Engineers under whom he served, more especially by Ex: Engineer Mr. J. D. Grant (now Suptg: Engineer) who has ~~been~~ recorded in the petitioner's service book his opinion about the satisfactory state of his work. Petitioner begs to submit that he served under this Ex: Engineer for a much longer period (about 5 years) than he served under present Ex: Engineer Mr. Jopp (only a few days) who recommended his dismissal. The several half yearly qualification reports also show that your petitioner discharged his duties satisfactorily. Above all petitioner begs to submit that this self same Suptg: Engineer, 2nd Circle, Mr. Hannan who approved of petitioner's removal has remarked not long ago on 1st. March 1890, (in disposing of Major L. Langley, R. E.'s complaint against the petitioner that he was behind hand with his work) that your petitioner had too much work to do and that he had been inconsiderately treated in the matter of fines (Vide Exhibit B). If however the Ex: Engineer can specify the particular cases in which petitioner was found neglectful in the discharge of his duties, petitioner is quite prepared to explain them satisfactorily.

(2) Absence without leave on the plea of ill health.

The petitioner is not aware of any occasion on which he absented himself without leave during his service of over eight years, probably the period referred to in the above charge is from 14th to 20th April 1890.

account

No doubt the petitioner was absent on ~~the~~ *account* of ill health but to substantiate which he has duly submitted medical certificates from the resident Apothecary of the place. The petitioner ~~also~~ applied for leave on the strength of this certificate but unfortunately for him the leave applied for ~~was not~~ *was not* been sanctioned. The petitioner was fully aware of the consequences of absenting himself without leave as laid down in Civil Service Regulation, and he did not stop away unnecessarily. The petitioner was forced by ill health, viz "Influenza" *at the locality, &* (the general epidemic disease prevalent throughout the presidency at that time in its highest stage) to stay away and he did his best to prove to the Ex: Engineer that he was really sick during the period, (copies of the certificates produced are herein enclosed (vide Exhibit C).

3 Malingering

This charge was entirely based on the Apothecary's letter No 64 dated 25-4-90 which however in his subsequent communication to the Ex: Engineer was countermanded by himself and he stated that his statement that your petitioner was malingering was mere an inference. The Apothecary's letters are herewith submitted (vide exhibit D).

The petitioner had no object in malingering. The petitioner begs also to state that the Apothecary's 2nd letter in which he stated that the original statement that your petitioner was malingering was simply an inference, was kept back from the Suptg: Engineer who was apparently misled in his conclusion against the petitioner. In his letter to the Suptg: Engineer re-

2673
11

commending the removal of petitioner, the Ex: Engineer K. E. Du: (Mr. Jopp) refers to the report by his predecessor (Major L. Langley R. E) regarding his continued absence on the plea of sickness which he (Major L. L) did not at all make any mention of it in his report. The S. E. replied to the Ex: Engineer to say that petitioner had too much work to do and that he has been inconsiderately treated in the matter of fines by Major L. L, R. E. (vide Exhibit B). No explanation on this account on the part of petitioner therefore appears necessary.

his explanation against

4. Petitioner begs to summarize the charges against him as follows:—

(1) Neglect of work, which in its very nature is too vague. The only explanation that petitioner can furnish in respect to this charge is that he is not aware of even a single instance in which he was neglectful, while on the other hand the fact, of his having received annual increments and won the good opinions of all the Officers under whom he served, will shew that he has been very careful in the discharge of his duties.

(2) Absence without leave.

Petitioner has duly submitted enclosed certificates in support of his absence and it is not understood how the Suptg: Engineer can make out that petitioner was absent without leave.

(3) Malingering.

This has been proved not to be true. The Ex: Engineer based this charge on information furnished by the Civil Apothecary, but as it was subsequently explained by the Civil Apothecary that his opinion was only an inference but that petitioner was really sick no further explanation on this account on the part of petitioner appears necessary.

(5) In conclusion your petitioner trusts that the above explanation may be considered satisfactory. The loss of his appointment which is the only means of his livelihood has created much anxiety and put him to any amount of hardship. He respectfully begs, therefore, that his pitiful case may be given your merciful consideration that he be restored to his appointment.

For which act of kindness your petitioner shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

*Your petitioner begs to remain
Honored Sir
Your most obedient servant
H. Ramiah
Late Cashier Kishna
Eastern Division
Bijwada.*

28/8/90

in pursuance of sanction, nor
did he submit any medical
certificate although he pleaded
ill-health in his Telegram.

The 3rd charge against him is
Malingering - The Civil Apothecary
who visited him at his own house
distinctly states that he was, in his
opinion, malingering. Vide Exhibits
D No 1 & D No 2 which accompany
the petition.

Yesterday, I personally questioned
the Civil Apothecary here Mr Lawrence,
who is a fully qualified medical
man being a Licentiate of the
Royal College of Physicians & Surgeons,
Edinburgh, where he took out his
degree, and he informed me that
he had no doubt whatever, but
that the Cashier was malingering,
and I see no reason to doubt
his statement.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedt Servt

Wm Orr
Superintending Engineer,
2
H. Circle.

2673

14

1st W. C. 90331

From

The Suptg Engineer
I Circle

To
The Chief Engineer
W. Dept

No 2673W of 10 Oct 1890

Dated 19th Sept 1890

Recd 24-9-90

No 1566 R.O.

Subd

15.6.90

Rammiah K. Late
Cashier Krishna Eastern
Siv. Offd. Report
fully on the ground
on which the - was
dismissed

133/9
10

appointed to the first
suitable vacancy in
the II circle.

The date of dismissal
was 20th April 90 &
if the time between
this date & the re-
-appointment is treated
on leave without
allowances, the clerk
will have received a
severe punishment for
maladjusting his
leave of absence will
not be broken.

P.O.

The Government considers
that the punishment of
dismissal was too severe
in the circumstances of the case
& directs that the clerk
be re-appointed on the
occurrence of the first
suitable vacancy in the II circle.
The period during which
the Rammiah is unemployed
will be treated on leave without
allowances.

It is observed with regret that
the instructions of P.O. No 2

No 2673W of 10 Oct 1890

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

2623
16

Read the following

from K. Rammiah, late Cashier, Krishna Eastern Div

dated 28th August 1890.

from the Suptg. Engrs II circle No. 1566 R.O. 21/9th Sept/90.

The Government

considers that the punishment
of dismissal was too severe
in the circumstances of the
case, and directs that the

44
9/10/90

clerk be re-appointed on
the occurrence of the first
suitable vacancy in the
II circle. The period during
which K. Rammiah is
unemployed will be treated

as

as leave without allow-

-ances.

2. It is observed with regret that the instructions in G.O. No. 2801 w of 20th October 1887 were altogether ignored by the Superintending Engineer.

No 2673 w of 10th

hury

29.9.90

S. C.

2.6.10.90

22/10/90

2/15/100

20/9

6-X-90.

To

The Asst. Engr. II
" Examiner, P.W. &
" Petitioner, para 10