

(1)

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 6
(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 9-90
(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் கருக்கொப்பம் 100

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

35

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	481	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் : 15-2-1892		199.

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

3 Sheets

ஆவண, கா-1-18,006-15-6-87.

[Handwritten signature]

Executive Engineer's Office
30 January 1892.

No. 331.

From

G. B. Lambert Esq.
Executive Engineer
Negapatam Division

To

The Superintending Engineer
5 Sirs. Madras.

Sir.

With reference to your
Endorsement No. 19 N.E.
dated 21st Instant, on G.O.
No. 127 N. dated 16th Instant,
I have the honor to report
that there appears to be no
evidence to show that more
than 65 trees were cut.

2. The charges which it is
proposed to bring against
the Maistry are as follows:
- (a) Cutting or allowing to be
cut without sanction
certain trees on the
banks of the Thercoodiyar.
 - (b) Selling them for much
less than their real
value.

(P)

1(c) Misappropriating the
sale proceeds.

As regards the latter, the
Sub Engineer informs me that
the Maistry has not yet
remitted the amount said
to be realized, but has
absconded.

3. I enclose a petition re-
ceived last December
from the Maistry for your
perusal. In it he admits
having sold the trees (as
he says in participation
of sanction) and explains
that they were cut by some
persons unknown, and had
fallen across the track.
He further states that he
cannot recover the amount
realized till he is relieved
from suspension. The
truth of this latter seems
doubtful. If the Maistry
was so anxious to sell the
trees before they were robbed,
he would not have allowed
them to be taken away
without

without receiving payment.

4. It appears to have been
the custom in this Division
for Maistries to be allowed
to sell trees & realize the
proceeds of the sale, permitting
the same to the subordinate
in charge. This practice
I have put a stop to, since
I assumed charge of this
Division last November.

I have the honor to
be, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
G. B. Lambert,
Executive Engineer,
Nagapattinam Dist.

Encls. 9.
Two Petitions from
Maistry of 27/2/91
& 23/11/91.
one letter N. 2501
of 5 Nov 91
from Sub Maistry.
- books with 6.
Enclosures and
English transla-
- tions of them.

N. 612

Forwarded to the Chief
Engineer P. W. Department,
with reference to G. O. N. 1574
dated 16 January 1892.

2. Under the circumstances
reported by the Executive
Engineer

101 Misconduct

Engines, I consider the
Machinery is not to blame
for offence a in para 1
of the above letter. that
offence b is one for which
he can hardly be pro-
secuted and that Offence
is the only one for which he
can be prosecuted.

Mr. Campbell Lieut. Col. R.E.

Superint. of Engines & Circles

6th February 1892.

Q.

48/3

13
10
15
1892

The Govt. agrees
in opinion with the
Capt. Eng. & directs
that the Machinery
be prosecuted on
the third charge
referred to

over 15.2.92

5.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle
11.2.92 circle

19/2 J.C. 18/2

P. W. CURRENT No. 1410

No. 157W of 16-1-72

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V CIRCLE,

To

THE

Chief Engineer

P. W. Department.

Dated

6th February 1892.

Recd.

ENCLOSURES.

9

Nb. 1. W

Mr. S. V. Venkatarama Iyer
T. V. V. Division

Reports on the nature of the
Charge in the case against the
with his own observations.

For orders with
reference to S.O. No
157W dated 16th January
1892.

S
112

W

5000
1-1-92

S. E. Iyer is correct
The existing rule is presented
on the 3rd charge.

W
1370

(3)

11-2-72