(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 14

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 12/91

(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

பொதுப்பணித் துறை

அரசாணை எண். 2760-W.	அச்சகம்
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	பலவகை
நாள் : 27.10.1893	199 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது.

ஆவண. க்.ா. 1—18,006—6-9-90.

To,

The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Madras

Respected Sir,

I respectfully beg to request that you will kindly arrange to send to my address below any orders that may be passed on my appeal petition, dated 29th July 1893, should the same be communicated to me before 27th instant.

I beg to remain,
Sir,
your most obedient servant,

Bobbacammal
23rd October 1893

C. Kengaroo
Late Accountant, D. P. W.
Door No. 7, Bills Rooms, Ooty

Borders sent to Collr 24/10/93

Sent to W on 25/10/93

1
2760

(C. No. 1201/8)

KEEP-WITH . CURRENT No.

dated 189 .

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1893. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

2/2760

Madras, 16 October 1893.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1373 D

To

W.

Since the issue of my reply office note No. I280 D. dated 6th. October I893, the Accountant General, P.W.D, has written to me to say that the leave allowances of the late Accountant A. Ranga Row up to date of his dismissal should be disbursed and adjusted against my office.

2. At the request of the Auditor, Assam-Bengal Railway Company, the leave allowances of the late accountant to end of February I893 were disbursed to him. Orders of Government are now requested as to whether the allowance due for Ist. to 29th. March I893 may be disbursed to him. Attention is however invited to G.O. No. II34 W. dated 24th. April I893.

C.

3000—3-2-91.

P. W. Department.

3/2960

Read the following:—

ion from A. Ranga Rau d/23rd September 1893.

e Note from the Ex. P.W. Acct's No 1280 Dd/6.x.93.

FOR ORDERS.

In his petition
dated 23rd September 1893,
A. Ranga Rau, late
Accountant prays Hon
pending disposal of
his appeal against
his dismissal, orders
may be issued for
the disbursement of
leave allowance
due to him for the
month of March 1892

The Examiner
reports that leave
allowance at Rs 5.
per mensem, is due

Ranga Rau from the
Assam-Bengal Railway
but that he has
received no authority
to disburse the amount.

He at the same
time draws attention
to G.O No 1134 W. dy 24 April
893.

G.O No 37 W dy 11. January
893 ordered the recovery
from the Accountant
of an overpayment
of Rs 166-11-3 made
in the Nellore Division
by G.O No 880. W. dy 30.
March 1893, the Accountant
was dismissed for
this and other charges,
and in G.O No 1134 W dy
24. April 1893 it was
decided that the
recovery of the Sum
of Rs 166-11-3 need
not be made unless

4/2760

there was any money
due to him.

It has now to be
decided whether the
Examiner should be
asked to recover the
amount of leave
allowance due from
the Assam-Bengal
Railway, and to credit
it to Government in
part recovery of the
Sum of Rs 166-11-3, or
to disburse it to
Ranga Rau.

W 16.10

16.10.93

Cn

FOR ORDERS.

Leave allowance for
to A. Renga Rau
late accountant.

Do on further pay

351
17/10
3/10

P. W. Department.

5/2760

Read the following:—

Petition from A. Renga Rau, late Accountant P.W.D. d/29 July 1893.
——do—— ——do—— ——do—— d/15 August 1893.
——do—— ——do—— ——do—— d/8th Sept. 1893.
Office Note from the Ex. S. A. Account No. 1283 A. d/6th Oct. 1893.
Telegram from A. Renga Rau dated 6th October 1893.

FOR ORDERS.

The long winded explanation of the Acc.t seems to me to leave the matter precisely as they were before.

The most important charge against is that of having dealings with a contractor, evidenced by the suit. They extended from March to June 91, and it is clear that at this time accountant with their wages to him for the Siddapalem tank were outstanding. The contract was subsequently cancelled & the Contractor's security 300th forfeited. The suit was brought in 1892, at the instance of the S.E. Boy whom Venguama Naiyudu had complained. It was struck off on the representation of a petition signed by the Vakils of both parties that the matter had been settled privately. Venguama Naiyudu asserts that this was done by a payment of Rs 300 in cash. The petitioner denies the dealings & denies that any such payment was made; asserts that he filed an answer (of which however there is no trace in the Court records) repudiating the claims; and alleges that to make out that the settlement in pursuance of which the suit was struck off was not made as urged by him. He also says that the suit was filed at the instigation of the Head Clerk who was the real contractor and at enmity with him. That the object was to recover the loss occasioned by the forfeiture of the contract. Of all this there is no evidence, and the only attempt at proof is the unsupported

By G.O. No. 880. W. d/30 March 1893, A. Renga Rau Accountant P.W.D. was removed from the Service on two charges (1) With respect to an overpayment of Rs. 186-11-3 to a piecework in the Nellore Division. (2) With respect to improper dealings with a Contractor B. Venguama Naidu in the same Division.

Renga Rau has submitted two appeals against his dismissal one dated 29th July and the other dated

15th August 1893.

former being a voluminous document of 29 pages of printed matter accompanied by three appendices A, B and C, - and the latter being a Supplement to the former

In the first petition he endeavours to refute the charges brought against him and attributes all his troubles to personal animus on the part of the Examiner, and in the second he states that in a further review of the overpayment of Rs 166 - 11 - 3, the Examiner makes the Sub Divisional Officer responsible for the mistake. (Govt. No. 1349 W.dy 18th May 1893).

With regard to the grounds on which Lenga Ram was dismissed, the Examiner

between the amount of the bill, the first item of the alleged payment in settlement. The amount for was however 343. 15. 10, being the balance of a claim of 373. 15. 10. The Accountant attempts to deny that the Ringanna Nayida was a contractor in his Spl. E. says that he did work for the Govt. to the amount. That is true enough, but the fact that he had undertaken a contract which he did not execute seems certain. The Govt. reply on this charge appears to me entirely unsupported & incredible; and I believe that he had the dealings alleged in the plaint & that he paid the stated sum in compromise. This charge alone is quite sufficient for his dismissal.

It is unnecessary to go in detail into the irregularities in the office which were the cause of this reduction, as they are overshadowed by the graver charge above dealt with.

With regard to the overpayment charge, whether the responsibility of the Sub Division Officer in regard to the 'G' audit is admitted that he was not free from blame - the responsibility for the payment on the 3rd bill on the 31 March is clearly the petitioners. The bill was paid without any counting though 10 per cent was deducted, the deduction merely affects the amount. The deduction allowed is not pending check of bills, but being check measurement, I believe; and petitioners argument that it was admissible by rule is unfounded.

I would inform the petitioner that after full consideration of all that he has put before them the Govt. see no reason to consider the order passed in his case and I would authorize the Examiner to take any steps open to him to recover the money of the Rs 166 odd, in whole or part, from the bill allowance or the money due to the petitioner from Govt.

Yes
Sd.

C/
20.9

Report that he has nothing to add to his Note on which G.O. No. 880. W. d/30 March 1893 was based, and he goes on to show that so far from having been actuated by any prejudice against the Petitioner, he throughout the case exercised uniform tolerance towards the man. He further demonstrates that his note regarding the responsibility of Sub Divisional Officer in connection with the overpayment of Rs 166 - 11 - 3 in no way conflicts with his previous notes holding the Accountant primarily responsible.

The late Accountant's appeal is now submitted for the consideration and orders of Government.

Yours Sup. Engineer
in the Vizag Dist
Recent complaints from
Contractors about the
Accountants peculiar dealings
with their bills. When I
came to work near the
Agency there were very
suspicious circumstances
in connection with the
acceptance of tenders & I think he is a fit man
to have an Accountant JH

Dated 15.8.93

JH 17.10

Govt

FOR ORDERS.

appeal against dismissal from A. Runga Rau late Accountant P.W.D.

Rd 351 HM 17-10.

Dw

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No 2760 Way 27 to 32 October 1893

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Petition from A. Runga Rau, late Accountant, P.W.D. dy 29th July 1893

——— Do ——— Do dy 15th August 1893

——— Do ——— Do dy 8th Septr. 1893

Office Note from the Examnr., P.W. Accounts, No. 1283A dy 6th Octr. 1893

Telegram from A. Runga Rau dated 6th Octr. 1893.

Petition from A. Runga Rau dy 23rd Septr. 1893

Office Note from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts, No. 1259D dy 6th Octr. 1893.

——— Do ——— No. 1343 D dy 16th Octr. 1893.

The petitions quoted above are appeals by A. Runga Rau, late Accountant, P.W.D. against his dismissal from the service of Govt. on charges brought against him by the Examiner, Public works Accounts.

2. His Excellency the Governor

Governor in Council has given full consideration to all that the petitioner has now urged in his defence, and sees no reason to re-consider the orders passed in his case.

3. The Examiner is authorised to take any steps open to him to recover from leave allowance or other money due to the petitioner, the sum, in whole or part, which has been overpaid this responsibility.

No 27 to Wa/27 October 1893

PWD 25/10/93

26/10

DESPATCHED 27

To

A. Runga Rau

The Examiner, P.W.A.