

31
No. 2318 W. d/13 September 1894

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.


PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

From the S.E. III Circle (H.E. No. 1357 d/27.8.94)

His Excellency the
Governor in Council is
not prepared to recon-
sider the orders passed
in para: 5 of G.O. No.
1806 W dated 18 July
1894. Seshappa
Mudallin's appointment
should therefore be
cancelled as already
directed.

S.E. III Circle
Lt. M. depts



S 5.9

CRS
6/9/94

C No. 6454

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Read the following:—

From the Supty Engineer III Circle No. 1357

d/27.8.94

+ I transferred to
the S.E. III Circle

FOR ORDERS.

I cannot find the overseer's
explanation of Aug. 10th which he
alludes to in his letter with further
explanation of Aug. 15th. This latter
appears to me very unsatisfactory
and in my opinion does not in any
way meet the charges brought against
him by the S.E. Engineer - which were
very definitely - viz: that the work
on the road wh. the overseer had
certified to, had not been put in -
nor anything like the amount of gravel
put on, which he had passed.

Even if it were only a case of suspicion
and this the C.E. allows - I do not
see why we should employ men against
whom grave suspicion exists - so long as
we can get men with perfectly good
characters. I still think his appointment
shd. be cancelled.

W.C.

8/9/94

8/9/94

W
3 Sep.

After full consideration
of all the history of this
case, I am bound to
say that I cannot see
any ground for insisting
on the dismissal of the
Sole overseer, or rather
on the cancellation of his
appointment.

2. Whatever suspicion may
attach to his proceedings
while employed under the
Local Fund Board, nothing
has been proved against
him, and as he was
originally appointed
by the Supty Engineer
(with whom such appointment

The Honble H.W. (Chris) C. J. E.
The Honble J. G. J. G. J.

rest) on the recommendation of the Local and Engineer, I think Government might say that they will not interfere with the Supt. Engineer's discretion in the matter.

3. It should be noted that Colonel Fraser has retired and has been succeeded by Lt. Col. Rawson.

No. 2318w. d. 13 September 1894.

Seehappu, Suboverseer
P.W.D., Amritsar 9th

No. 2318w. d. 13 Sept: 1894

L
My W

CHM
1/9 94

INDEXED.
26/9


2.C.C.
17/9

131
22

The Hon. Mr. H. W. P. H. C. 92
The Hon. Mr. J. G. G. 93

No. 2318 W. d. 13 September 1894.

INDEXED.
26/9
2. C. C.
17/9



Colonel A. J. Fraser R. S.
Superintending Engineer
III Circle, Bellary

I have the Executive Engineer
Cuddapa Division

Honored Sir

In continuation of my explanations dated 10th instant, I beg to submit the following facts, in reference to the proceedings of the Grant and District Board dated 20th March/94.

I In para I the President says that no metal was used in L-1-8 & that the quantity of gravel said to be used in L-1-7 was not as much as is stated in the bill. He has entirely overlooked my explanation which points out that the road was not only allowed to consolidate for about 5 months but was also scoured by heavy showers. The mere fact of his saying that this fact cannot be admitted as an explanation is in my humble opinion an arbitrary decision.

II In para II he says my admitting that the soil from the side drains was allowed to be used to bring the road to proper section is a virtual admission that the bills are false. It is not so. I have clearly told him that the quantity of gravel provided

the estimate was not sufficient to do
for sectioning the road & raising the same.
So soil from the side drains had to be
used, but by separate charges were made
for this was the quantity of gravel
needed to make up the deficiency. The
President is therefore wrong in taking
this as an admission of false bills —

With reference to para 5 of the proceedings
I must submit that the President cannot
withhold either my pay & travelling allowances
or Augustus' allowance due to me as his decision
is based not on popular enquiry of the sides
but on mere one sided evidence. Besides
this he cannot enforce any of his orders
upon me after I was regularly relieved
by the Local Fund Engineer under whose
direct orders I was working.

I would therefore beg that the fore-
going facts may be kindly considered
& orders passed for my reinstatement.

I beg to remain
Yours most obedient servant
B. Chhabra

1578184

Submitted.
In. Magasingh
16/8/94

Recd. 6/8/94
21/8/94

Sub. received
under suspension
No. 1293 of 24/8/94
Forwarded

3/9/94
21/8/94

Explanation of Seshappa, Sub. wa-
ter under suspension bearing endorsement
No. 1293 of 24/8/94 of the Executive
Engineer Buddah Division

No. 1351
27-8-94

Forwarded to the Chief Engi-
neer P. W. Department in continuation
of this office letter No. 1196 of 10.8.94.

809 D
20.8.94

A. Lawlor
27.8.94
Suptg Engineer
M. Bickel

From
Lieut Col C. E. Rowson
Asst Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle Bellary

To The Chief Engineer
G. W. S.
Madras

Dated 27th August/94
Recd 29th Sept 1351 Encl

Further explanation
of Encl Engineer's report
Forwarding a

Transmitted

O.L.S. 318
R 12/9

C No. 6454

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Read the following:—

From the Supt Engineer III Circle No. 1351

d/ 27.8.94

+ Transmitted to
the 2nd Circle

FOR ORDERS.

I cannot find the overseer's explanation of Aug. 10th which he alludes to in his letter with further explanation of Aug. 15th. This latter appears to me very unsatisfactory and in my opinion does not in any way meet the charges brought against him by the S. E. Engineer - which were exceedingly definite - viz: that the work on the road wh. the overseer had certified to, had not been put in - nor anything like the amount of gravel put on, which he had passed. Even if it were only a case of suspicion, and this the C. E. allows - I do not see why we should employ men against whom grave suspicion exists - so long as we can get men with perfectly good characters. I still think his appointment should be cancelled.

W
3 Sep.
8/9/94
29/9/94

After full consideration of all the history of this case, I am bound to say that I cannot see any ground for insisting on the dismissal of the Sub overseer, or rather on the cancellation of his appointment. 2. Whatever suspicion may attach to his proceedings while employed under the Local Fund Board, nothing has been proved against him, and as he was originally appointed by the Supt Engineer (with whom such appointment

C No. 6454

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Read the following:—

From the Supty Engineer III Circle No 1357

d/27.8.94

+ Transferred to
the 2nd Supty

FOR ORDERS.

I cannot find the overseer's explanation of Aug. 10th which he alludes to in his letter with further explanation of Aug. 15th. This latter appears to me very unsatisfactory and in my opinion does not in any way meet the charges brought against him by the S. E. Engineer - which were exceedingly definite - viz: that the work on the road wh. the overseer had certified to, had not been put in - nor anything like the amount of gravel put on, which he had passed. Even if it were only a case of suspicion and this the C. E. allows - I do not see why we should employ men against whom grave suspicion exists - to long as we can get men with perfectly good characters. I still think his appointment should be cancelled.

live. 8/9/94
8/9/94

W
3 Sep.

After full consideration of all the history of this case, I am bound to say that I cannot see any ground for insisting on the dismissal of the Sub overseer, or rather on the cancellation of his appointment.

2. Whatever suspicion may attach to his proceedings while employed under the Local Fund Board, nothing has been proved against him, and as he was originally appointed by the Supty Engineer (with whom such appointment

No. 2318 W. d/13 September 1894

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

in the S. E. III Circle (H. E. No 1357 d/27.8.94)

His Excellency the Governor in Council is not prepared to reconsider the orders passed in para: 5 of G.O. No 1806 W dated 18 July 1894. Seshappa Mudallin's appointment should therefore be cancelled as already directed.

S. E. III Circle
Lt M. dept

DESPATCHED
13 SEP. 94

S. 5.9

CMS
6/9/94