(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 22

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 10/92

(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப்பணித் துறை

அரசாணை எண். 863 W அச்சகம்

மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். பலவகை

நாள் : 27-3-1893 199 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது.

ஆவண. கா. 1—18,006—6-9-90.



ONE ANNA



[illegible]

2

P. W. CURRENT No. 863

~~CURRENT NO. 52~~

Marine (1893) DEPARTMENT.

From

THE PRESIDENCY PORT OFFICER,
Madras,

To

THE CHIEF SECY. TO GOVERNMENT,
MARINE DEPARTMENT,
Fort St. George.

No. 956/22 G

Dated 16 } January 1893.
Received }
En 2

CHIEF SECRETARY
19 JAN 93
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

No.

Subject.

Forwarding for sanction
nd allotment of Funds
n Estimate for Rs. 330/-
or demarcating the Port
imits of Cocanada and
oringa

Transferred

Ans. D/27 January 1893 No. 169
~~[illegible]~~
26 Jan

Approved and transferred to the Public Works Department.

Ag. Chief Secretary

F.D.B. 21/1

C. 24/1
R. 26/1

COURT FEE
INDIA
ONE ANNA
1/16 R.

[illegible]
28 - 9 - 92
[illegible]

863/3

[illegible]

Th [illegible] d no deposition in writing

[illegible]

No 12146 [illegible] forwarded [illegible] to the Officer [illegible] dated 7 October 92 is [illegible]

No 11146

[illegible] Forwarded to the [illegible] Officer [illegible] for [illegible] in continuation of this office No 3605 of 11 July [illegible] [illegible]

Transferred

C 24/1
R 26/1

Ind

8/3

Negapatam [illegible] 3470 14 Oct 92

From
Officer in ch: of
[illegible] Sub Dn

To
The Officer in ch: of
Negapatam Division

No 1392

Dated 22
Despd
Recd
} September 1892

Enclo:

Sir

With reference to your Endorsement No 3605 d/11 July 1892 returned herewith I have the honor to report that no encroachments have been made in the Chandramady River as complained therein — The lands in which they have been planting are their own private lands. Dymasla accounts do not recognise regular banks to the Chandramady at this point and give a width of 18 ft. from margin to margin — The river at present measures as much and even more

2. Iyarappa Mudaliar has been given [illegible] on two occasions, once when repairing the Alwangaray aqueduct and again when repairing bridging Melavalakkarai [illegible] In the former instance he deposited Rs 20 for 40 Cyds. but was supplied only 20 Cyds. the quantity required for the work. But before he could remove them certain ryots interfered and protested against the removal saying that they belonged to

The

[illegible] Engrs Office Negapatam
[illegible] Negapatam d/8th March 1893

cutive Engrs Office Negapatam

tion Negapatam d/8 March 1893

to them. In another 20 cyds to them to be supplied to the Contractor in order that the work may not be delayed. The bricks of the 1st lot were finally found not to be private but to belong to the Department. It was however not thought necessary to sell them in auction as it would not fetch anything more than what Iyrappa Mudaly had originally paid for them and they were allowed to be given over to him. In the latter instance he was supplied to bricks just the quantity required for the work—

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedt Servant

Assistt Engineer

No 1214 S Camp

It does not appear that any enquiry was made in the presence of the petitioner nor is it [illegible] whether the petitioner admits that this was written by him - If so Please report at once

7/10/92

Executive Engineer

Transferred

From

The officer in charge of

Tirutturaipundi

Sub Division

To

The officer in charge of

Negapatam Division

Station.

Dated 31 October 1892.

Despd 6/11

Received

1/11/92

No. 1675 E

Enclosure 1 No 360 S / 11-7-92

1 No 1241 S / 10-10-92

Sir

In reply to your No 1214 S and 1241 S dated respectively 8th & 10th October 1892 herewith returned I have the honor to report that the enquiry was made in the presence of the petitioner & that the petitioner admits the petition having been written by him.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most Obedient Servant

Assistant Engineer

~~1554 d/19/11/92~~

821

The petitioner has now forwarded that wood valued about 300 Rs or more has been given to Iyarappa - On this point what officer's report is not clear. In his report 30 cyds or ... have been sold to Iyarapp

his deposition in writing

...cutive Engrs Office Negapatam
...ation Negapatam d/8th March 1893

for about 20 Rs – When a person comes forward making the allegation, it is necessary to establish how and from ... have been only given as if that person ... perjuries, the party concerned is ~~could from~~ the Revenue Authority prosecute him.

2. On receipt of the further report on this case which should be ... sent orders of the Supdg Engr will be obtained for prosecution.

18/11/92

C.C.
Rd 25/2/93

From

4601

883/C

The Assistant Engineer
Tirutturaipundi

To

The Executive Engineer
Negapatam Division

17/12/92

Station Tirutturaipundi
Dated 13 }
Despd 15 } December 1892.
Received }

No 1981 C

Enclosure :

Sir

In Continuation of this office No $\frac{1901}{3/12/92}$ I have the honor to report that no regular deposition in writing was taken from petitioner Thiyagaraja Pillay to the effect that the petition was written by him and he was the author of it. He has however admitted its genuineness though not in writing

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt. Servt.
C Gopalan
Assistant Engineer

Transferred

... his deposition

No 1933

The ~~[illegible]~~ Asst Engr appears
has not stated if the
overseer is prepared
to prosecute ~~[illegible]~~
the Arparaja Pillay &
this he ought to have
done and he should
now report at once
vide this office No 1554
of 19 Nov 92

[illegible]
21-12-92
Executive Engineer

(To be returned)

From

The Assistant Engineer
Tirutturaipundi

To

The Executive Engineer
Negapatam Dn.

Station. Tirutturaipundi.

Dated 25th
Despd 25th December 1892
Received

No. 2079

Enclosures .. One

Sir

With reference to your No 1933/21.12.92 returned herewith calling for report as to whether Mr. V[illegible] 3rd Overseer is willing to prosecute Arparaja Pillay, I have the honor to inform that as petitioner is not considered to be a man of any importance, the Overseer is of opinion that it is of no advantage to him to undertake a prosecution at his own cost. If Government be willing to pay for the cost of it the Overseer is willing to have the prosecution conducted & not otherwise.

NEGAPATAM DIV. 28 DEC 92

28/12/92

883

...ive Engrs Office Negapatam

...enquiry in presence of the

...his deposition in writing

...en the Engrs Office Vizagapatam
...tion Vizagapatam d/ 8th March 1893

I have the honor to...

Sir
Your most Obedt Ser...

Assistant Engin...

56
PW 2/7/93

C No 2561

86/8

Secy

I think we have

recd. petitions

against this

overseer, they

were sent into

the S.E.

ANS
11.2.93

Dir

Papers submitted

Previous petitions against the man were either anonymous or pseudonymous.

Cs
13/3/93

I hardly think that are sufficient grounds for authorising this proposed prosecution

The case does not ...

...ed his deposition in writing

seem to be complete

The Reps. might be translated - At present I can only make out vaguely what the charges against the overseer are —

I do not think that Mr. R. Gopala Aiyar, judging from his letters, has taken much trouble in the matter, & I think it would be as well if the Ex. Eng. himself made a personal enquiry into the case before taking it up or decis

DWR
16-2-93

No. 86 S.E.

Executive Engrs Office Negapatam
Station Negapatam d/8th March 1893

From
The Executive Engineer Negapatam Division

To
The Superintending Engineer 1st Circle

Sir

I have the honor to bring to your notice that one Thiagaraja Pillay of Thirukuvalai village Negapatam Taluq has sent in 2 petitions d/5th July and 20th September 1892 complaining against overseer Mr. Visvanatha Iyer to the effect that he received bribes &c by allowing Thirukuvalai Kattay Thambiran to make encroachments in Chandranady river in the said village limits and giving Government firewood gratis to one Iyarappa Modeliar an agent of the Thambiran and such like.

2. These petitions were duly referred to the Sub Division Officer Tiruthuraipundy who took a long time for its disposal, and his report is ultimately to the effect that the allegations of the petitions are unfounded.

3. Thereupon I asked Mr. Gopala Iyer whether he had conducted the enquiry in presence of the petitioner and obtained his deposition in writing

and whether the overseer was prepared to prosecute him for making false charges against him. To this the Sub Division officer reports that the enquiry was made in the presence of the petitioner who admitted of having written it although he failed to obtain any deposition in writing and the overseer is of opinion that the petitioner being a man of no importance it is of no advantage to prosecute him at his own cost but if Government be willing to pay for the cost the overseer is willing to have the prosecution conducted.

4. The 2 petitions and Sub Divisional officers Nos $\frac{1392\,E}{29:9:92}$, $\frac{1675\,E}{31:10:92}$, $\frac{1981\,E}{13:12:92}$ and $\frac{2079\,E}{25:12:92}$ are submitted in original for your reference and kind return.

5. In this district it seems usual to send anonymous and pseudonymous petitions and I have received nearly 6 petitions against this particular overseer since my assumption of charge and it rarely happens that the writer is found out. In the present instance the writer has come forward personally to identify himself as the author of the petitions although the Sub Division officer reports that the Complaints of the petitions are unfounded and it therefore appears in my opinion desirable that the petitioner should be prosecuted either by the overseer or by Government whichever course you think proper with a view to reduce bother and vexation and waste of labor and time caused in disposal of such petitions.

I have &c.

Sd/ S. Subrozacharias
Executive Engineer

No. 102 W

Enclosures
Six - to be returned

Submitted to the Chief Engineer P.W. Department with a request that permission may be granted to prosecute at Govt. expense.

2. The investigation of false complaints takes up a good deal of time which might be better employed and it is therefore desirable to take steps to discourage them

14th March
1893

J. Hammen
Supdg. Engineer V Circle

P. W. CURRENT No. 2527

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P.W. Deptt.

Dated 14th March 1893.
Recd. 16th

ENCLOSURES. 6

No. 3926C a/23-8-92
" 3975C-29-8-92
" 4181C-16-9-92
" 4291C-28-9-92
" 4576C-21-10-92

No. 102 W.

Petitions against Overseer Viswanatha Iyer Negapatam Dn. V.

Submits copy of a letter from Exe: Engr. Negm. Dn. submitting ___ for sanction to prosecute the Petitioner & requests that permission may be granted to prosecute at Govt. expense —

For orders. It does not seem to me advisable for Government to take any action in the matter.

I quite agree.

20/3/93

23 Mar

No. 863 W d/- 29th March 1893

The Govt. does not consider it advisable to take any action in this matter.

27/3/93

S.E. V. Circle

6/4

21/3 R 4/3