...ORKS (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 36464

DATED 19. December 96

[Despatch Abstract.]

...ory: Lieut: and ~~Capt~~ Assistant Commissary J. Kelly: Assistant Engineer: Passing orders on papers relating to Appeals from — accusing Lt Somers Eve Ex: Engineer Bellaire Dt of treating him with undue harshness & severity.

—.

T.C. 3102

[F.W. 25. 8,000—30-11-96.]

Indexed.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

DEPARTMENT.

From S.G. No. 3646 W of 19-12-96.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Endorsement by the Pr. Secy. to Govt. the Govr., on petition from Lieut J. Kelly, dated 29th August 1896.

— do — do — on do dated 6th September 1896.

From the Supdt Engr. III Circle No 2406 W of 3 Nov. 1896.

— — — do — — — 2663 W of 23 — — — —

These papers relate to appeals from Army Lieutenant & Quarter. Commissary J. Kelly, Asst. Engr., Superintendency, in which he accuses Mr Somers Eve, Ex. Engr Bellary division, of treating him with undue harshness and severity.

2. His Excy. the Govr in Council having carefully perused the Correspondence, is informed that Mr Somers Eve showed a want of judgment in his treatment of Lieut. Kelly, which the Govt. regrets; and that in keeping back Lieut. Kelly's appeals, he acted in a manner which was unjustifiable, and

[P. W. 40. 50 — 8-9-96.]

in contravention of rules - His ex-
planation of his action is un-
satisfactory, & the Govr in Council
regrets that it is necessary to
pass a severe censure upon him.

2. The offences with which Lieut.
Kelly are charged are venial, &
will be passed over.

3. Lieut. Kelly will be in-
formed that the Govr having
considered his appeals, is of
opinion that Mr Somers's
treatment of him was not
justified, & that Mr Somers
has been informed ac-
cordingly.

Cs

14/12/26

JTD
14.12.26

D 14/12/26

S.S. III Circle. For communica-
to Mr Somers &c -
Hony Lieut. J. Kelly. Aust Regt
Chase Hotel W

W

Lieut. Kelly's appeals.

Draft order submitted
in accordance with His Excy's
note.

Some reply must be
given to Lieut. Kelly to his
appeals, & the form in which
this should be done seems
difficult to decide - It
hardly appears proper to tell
him that Mr Somers has
been censured by Govr.

If approved, para 3 only
of the G.O. will be communi-
cated to Lieut. Kelly, as it
is thought too much of
might be modified.

For orders.

Cs
14.12.26.

W

Draft resubmitted
for initials if approved.

Cs
14.12.26

JTD
14.12.26

P. W. Department.

Read the following:—

Endorsement by the Private Secretary to His Excellency the Governor, on petition from Lieut. J. Kelly, dated 29th August 1896.

——— Do —— Do — dated 6th September 1896.

From the Supdg. Engineer III Circle, No. 2406 W. dated 3d November 1896.

——— Do ——— No. 2663 W. — 23d —— do ——

FOR ORDERS.

This is a case in which Honorary Lieut. J. Kelly, Assistant Commissary and — Assistant Engineer 3d grade accuses Mr. Somers Eve Executive Engineer Bellary Division of treating him with undue harshness and severity.

2. Lieut. Kelly is an officer of 28 years Service who in the earlier part of his career appears to have done good work. He served under me in 1880 and did excellent work in restoring the Vellore temple, but he seems to have deteriorated of late years as he was entered "not recommended" in all the half yearly promotion rolls for 1893 and 1894.

3. Mr. Somers Eve who has also

1. Mr. Somers Eve should be told that he showed a want of good judgment in his treatment of Lt. Kelly, which the Govt. regrets; and that in keeping books he acted in a manner which Lt. Kelly's appeals were unjustifiable and in contravention of rules, that his explanation of his action is unsatisfactory, and that the G. in C. regrets that it is necessary to pass a severe censure upon him.

2. The offences committed by Lt Kelly are venial, and may be passed over. But he must be moved from Bellary, to some other district.

43—500-27-4-94.

M. M. 11.12.96

also served under me is a zealous and hard working officer but with a hasty temper and very little tact and judgment and is inclined to treat his subordinates as machines and he is no doubt quite capable of making things unpleasant for those who won't work, in which perhaps he is right so long as he is just.

4. The details of the case are given in the note by the Under Secretary (flagged 1) and after perusal of all the papers I am of opinion that Mr. Somers Eve did not treat Lieut. Kelly with proper consideration; the latter apparently came to the Bellary Division under a cloud and the Executive Engineer finding he did not work as well as he thought he should have done, seems to have made up his mind to get rid of him. The most serious part of Mr. Somers Eve's conduct is his not forwarding on appeals sent by Lieut. Kelly through him to the Superintending Engineer and the Chief Engineer. He excuses his conduct in this respect by stating that he suppressed the appeals from

from friendly motives as he would have had to report badly on him, but this is contradicted by his general treatment of Lieut Kelly and his suppression of the appeals was in any circumstances quite unjustifiable and contrary to rules.

5. As regards points marked (a), (b) &c, in his petition to His Excellency into which Lieut. Kelly requests an inquiry (a), (b) have been answered in the note by the Under Secretary but I need only make a few remarks. Lieut. Kelly was not justified in coming into Bellary for the Easter holidays without permission and this bad start no doubt prejudiced Mr. Somers Eve still more against him. I do not consider Mr. Somers Eve is justified in making his remarks about Lieut Kelly suffering from an excess of alcohol without giving proof and so long after and only when he is in a way put on his own defence.

(c) Lieut Kelly was no doubt superseded because he had been entered as "not recommended" in the promotion rolls for 1893-94.

(d) There appears to have been no

no special report against Lieut. Kelly made by Mr. Somers Eve.

(f) Mr. Somers Eve explains that Lieut. Kelly in his opinion travelled unnecessarily and the work done was unsatisfactory.

(g). The fine was inflicted on Mr. Somers Eve's own authority.

(h). The fine was afterwards removed as Mr. Somers Eve found it was contrary to rules.

(K.) The money was retrenched by the Examiner and Mr. Somers Eve had nothing to do with the matter.

(L) and (M). The retrenchment was made on account of salary overdrawn and the rule quoted by Lieut. Kelly only refers to retrenchments in cases of loss of Government money, bad work, &c.

6 The case is a peculiar one and I am of opinion that both officers are to blame. Lieut. Kelly did not work satisfactorily and incurred the displeasure of his Superior who did not exercise sufficient tact and failed to show towards an officer in the position of Lieut Kelly the consideration to which he was entitled. Lieut. Kelly has used language in his memorials regarding his Superior officer

Yes. But I think Mr. Somers Eve was more to blame than Lt. Kelly. A.H.

FOR ORDERS.

I do not think this censure considering the circumstances. A.H.

censured.

7. Mr. Somers Eve deserves to be severely reprimanded for suppressing the appeal, his reasons for doing so being altogether unsatisfactory.

8/12/96

1901

Defts 5

Note by the Chief Engineer

—

Mr. Somers Roe. Executive Engineer Bellary Divn. replies to the allegations of harsh treatment preferred by Lt. Kelly - Hons. Assist. Engineer

—

Flag. L.

Lt. Kelly was transferred from Trichinopoly Bellary in March 95 apparently under a cloud as the Supt. Engineer was told not to post him to Sub Divn. unless he thought fit.

Lt. Kelly arrived in Bellary on 26th March - The Executive Engineer was absent from Head Qrs.

Instructions had been left by the Executive Engineer that Lt. Kelley was to check B.M.'s of Sangur Project - ~~The contractors~~

Flag. L.

Lt Kelley started, but says his cartman took him to a place called Doda Sugur at the end of the channel where he apparently did some levelling which was useless - This took him on to the Easter Holidays, when he returned to Bellary, & remained there until 17th He got a cheque for his pay & imprest & arrived at Sangur on 20th & commenced checking levels on 22nd - The Executive Engineer says that Lt Kelly washed his

Flag B ~~Flag B~~ — para 3.

Flag B_2 — para 3

time & apparently Lt Kelly wishes it to be understood that the instructions left him were insufficient.

Flag J — On 28th April the Executive Engineer wrote to Lt Kelly objecting to his coming into Bellary & informing him that his Head Qrs were to be at Siruguppa. The Sr. Engineer then goes on to say that Lt Kelly has been sent to him with anything but a satisfactory character & states that he is determined to get work from his subordinates or make things unpleasant for them.

Flag K — Lt Kelly in para 7 says that it is the first time he has heard that he had anything but a satisfactory character, & says that he was sent to Bellary because a junior was placed in charge at Trichy & to free Mrs Lagassee for Cuddapah. He then asks the Exec. Engr. to send him a copy of the report touching his character to enable him to take steps to clear the same.

Flag B. para 7 — The Executive Engineer states that the unsatisfactory character was gathered from conversations with Col. Drake-Brockman. Mr. Burton & Mr. Norfor & from enclosure flagged L. Up to this point there was no other reason known to the Executive Engineer for stating that Lt Kelly's character was unsatisfactory.

In the beginning of May Lt Kelly appears to have got ill with sore eyes, & on the advice of the local Medical officer proceeded to Bellary to consult the District Surgeon.

Flag B 2 para 9 & 10 — Lt Kelly attributes his illness to Exposure during the hot months of April, & to the fact that the only shelter he had was a 10' square tent.

Flag H & I — Lt Kelly put himself in the hands of the District Surgeon & the Ex Engr. says that the District Surgeon informed him privately that Lt Kelly was suffering from excessive drink. This is a serious charge & is not supported by any written statement of the District Surgeon.

Flag B 2 para 11 — The Executive Engineer now has a personal interview with Lt Kelly. Lt Kelly's report of the interview is send by the Executive Engineer to be a contradiction of facts: At the conclusion of the interview Lt Kelly agreed to send in his application for furlough although he protested he could not afford to take furlough.

Flag B. para 11 — The Executive Engineer is here no doubt carrying out his threat to make things unpleasant for those that wont work.

Flag M — Lt Kelly was eventually transferred to work under the S.D.O. with head-quarters at Pennakonda.

He appears to have met the S.E. in camp & got permission from the S.E. to apply to have his furlough cancelled about which there was some correspondence

Flags. O. R. S. T. U. V

Flag B
para 16

Flag B2
para 25

Flag Z.

Flag Z1

Flag B2
para 27

The S.E. is evidently annoyed at his cancelment. The S.S. ~~thought that by not reporting on Lt Kelly~~ says he refrained from reporting on Lt Kelly as he was going on furlough. & apparently would have reported on Lt Kelly if he had not taken furlough.

Then follow minor complaints mostly on professional subjects which it is not worth while going into.

Lt Kelly received intimation that his wife was ill in Bellary & the Asstt Surgeon intimated that it would be advisable to take her to Bangalore. Lt Kelly applied for six months leave in consequence. The six months leave was not granted as the S.S. said he was short handed but casual leave, & the illness of Lt Kelly taking his wife to Bangalore was suggested. This casual was sanctioned by S.Sec. Lt Kelly says that S.S. statement that he was short handed in "hostilities & cantine". This language should be noted.

A reference to the Secretaries office shows the following establishment in Bellary in Oct & Nov. 1895.

	Ex. Eng.	Asstt. Surg	Upper Subordinates Permanent & Temp'y	
Oct.	2.	0.	5	4 = 11
Nov.	2.	0.	4.	4 = 10

The sanctioned strength for Bellary is 13. The S.S. was therefore quite right in saying he was short-handed

Lt Kelly eventually telegraphed to the Chief Engineer who granted him leave.

Flag A2

~~Flag B~~
Flag A.

The above are the principle me[illegible] contained of the petition & the [illegible] Col. Pennycuick R.E. & Hon'ble Col. [illegible] R.E.

With reference to the memorial to H.E. the Governor para (a) is disposed in the above. In para (b). Lt Kelly asks if his memorials were forwarded by the S.S. The S.S. in para (b) replies thereto. He states that he did not forward the memorials because if he had he would have had to report so badly on Lt Kelly that he would have irretrievably injured him. He states that he only had to report that his illness was reported by the District Surgeon to be due to excessive use of alcohol to ruin him. It is a pity that no written statement to this effect has been received from the District Surgeon & he might be called on to state what was the matter with Lt Kelly. The S.S. states that he suppressed the memorial out of kindliness.

Para (c). Although the S.S. put R. against Lt Kelly's name for the half year ending June 30. 95. he had N.R. against his name for $\frac{93}{1}$. $\frac{93}{2}$. $\frac{94}{1}$. $\frac{94}{2}$. It was probably on this account that he was passed over. When promotions vacancies occurred.

para (d). There was no [illegible] report made against Lt Kelly on account of which he was suspended

para (e). Lt Kelly asks if he did anything contrary to Dept[l] rules. The S.S. says he only direct to S.S. to cancel his leave. It is shown that he did not break rule in this case

Flags Q.R.S.T.U.V.

[illegible] reported for not [illegible]

2nd that L broke the rules by sending a wiring direct to Chief Engineer about his 2nd leave. There does not appear to be any correspondence about this, & if Lt Kelly communicated with Chief Engineer without sending a copy to E.E. he broke the rule.

Paras (f to h). Lt Kelly was apparently fined Rs 63. by deduction from his travelling allowance - as the E.E. thought he had not been working hard. This fine was afterwards remitted as the E.E. says the procedure was wrong. He ought to have recommended him for a fine & if it had been sanctioned by proper authority then inflicted it.

Paras (k. l. m). The retrenchment was made in accordance with rules &c. & need not be gone into as it apparently has nothing to do with the E.E.-s

After going over the whole case it is apparent that the E.E. was in the first instance prejudiced against Lt Kelly from what he had heard of him & from the order for his transfer.

Flag L. It is doubtful if the E.E. exercised tact in putting an elderly man on survey work during the hottest months of the year, & so far as can be judged the instructions given him for the survey were inadequate (vide a note left with the accountant.)

Flag L. Lt Kelly made no progress with this survey & then the E.E. addressed him a letter in which among other things he told him his previous character was unsatisfactory. This seems to have greatly annoyed Lt K.

Flag J. The E.E. undoubtedly threatened that he would make things unpleasant for him if he did not work. & from the whole tenor of the correspondence & explanation it is evident the E.E. determined to get rid of Lt Kelly out of his division.

Flag M. There is no doubt that Lt Kelly was forced to apply for leave & apparently the E.E. threatened to report badly on him if he did not. This procedure does not seem correct. The leave was subsequently cancelled ~~The E.E. afterwards cancelled~~

Flag B. para 16 ~~to absent~~

There is no doubt that from this onwards there was bad feeling between the E.E. & Lt Kelly. Lt Kelly has on several occasions used unseemly language in his memorials with reference to his superior officers. This will be noted.

Flag B2 Para 27 The reasons given by the E.E. for suppressing the memorials are very unsatisfactory

1897
3. 12. 96.

Case 10742

Dear

Mrs Somers. Sue, Ex. Engr; Bellary Dn, replies to certain charges of harsh treatment &c brought against him by Staff Lieut J. Kelly –

The charges were made in memorials (1) to Col. Pennycuick dd 21-12-95, (2) to Mrs Sue Somers dd 29.8.96 & (3) to Colonel Campbell dd 6.9.96 –

There are three letters & petitions to the S.S. & Govt. but they are all on the same subject & the gist of the matter are in the papers (1) (2) & (3) above. Mrs Somers-Sue replies to these in three separate letters, taking Lieut. Kelly's petitions seriatim –

The whole matter must now be laid before Mrs Sue Somers

This is a case in which Mrs Sue Somers Executive Engineer of Bellary accuses her Executive Engineer Lieut Kelly of harsh treatment & cruelty to his native servants.

Lieut Kelly is an officer of [illegible] years service in the earlier part of his career officers & has done good work. He served under Mrs Sue Somers husband in 1880 and his accounts book is noted by the Public Works Secretary, but he seems to have deteriorated of late years & to be unsatisfactory in his dealings with the natives. The character roll for 1895 & 96 [illegible] "not recommended" & also the latter "not recommended" for 95 & 96 but Lieut Kelly protested both of these years.

Mrs Somers Sue is a zealous hard working lady but with a hasty temper & very little tact in particular & is reported to treat her subordinates & natives alike & is also said to be very exacting & to require work carried out at once, & which perhaps is not to be wondered at as she is young & inexperienced.

The details of the case are given in the [illegible] of the Govt Secretary (Public Works) and

W.S. 9/12

Public Works (1896) Departmen

CURRENT No. 80266
10742/96

3435C d/24 Sept 1896

Order

Referred to the Supty Engineer III Circle for detailed reply to the allegations made by Lieut. Kelly, and for report as to why the petition to Colonel Penny wick dated 21st Dec 1895 was not forwarded.

Dy Sec Cambridge Colonel RE
No 1937 0/2-Jy 96 Asst Secretary
Forwarded to the Executive Engineer, Bellary Division for early report

A Beckinton
Submitted Engineer-in-Chief
29.5.96

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER. No. 531 3.9.96 P.W.D. BELLARY DIVISION.

From Lieut Kelly

No.

Dated Aug 29. } 1896.
Received Sept 2. }
Enclosures 6.
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Stating that his appeals against the harsh treatment of the E.E. Bellary Dn (Mr Somers Eve) have not been considered & praying for retransfer to the Military Works dept

[P. W. 25. 1,000—6-9-95.]

05/366A.

Sent Kelly, Lieut Col ... The Chief Engineer Madras ... of appeal that the said ... allow. He does not ... the Secretary ... of his address the ... officer that on perusal ... leaves to offer on the petition ... he thinks the ... to be unable. He thinks he ... Company in this ... his address ... to this ... Engineer ... The Govt ... departmental ... explanation ... he sees ... unsatisfactory.

8/12/96

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	3436 C	PW	24-9-96.
	4407 C	"	25-11-96.
	2682 C	"	5-9-95
			+ papers.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Through the Chief Engineer

Bangalore
29th August 96

To

His Excellency
Sir Arthur Elibank Havelock, G.C.M.G., K.C.I.E.
Governor
Madras

The humble petition of
Lieut. J. Kelly.
Asst. Engineer. P.W.D.

Sheweth

That Your Petitioner by his letters dated 9th 13th 18th and 22nd November, submitted through Mr. Sommers Eve, the Executive Engineer, Bellary Division brought to the notice of the Superintending Engineer the cruel and harsh treatment he received at the hands of the former, that he obtained no redress whatever.

That Your Petitioner then submitted a memorial through the same officer to the Chief Engineer which he regrets to say has not yet been favoured with a reply.

That Your Petitioner then about nine months after addressed the Superintending Engineer direct on the matter. That from this it could be easily seen that Your Petitioner adopted the procedure laid down by the rules of the Department and that notwithstanding he received no redress.

That Your Petitioner as a last resource has no other alternative than to follow the rules laid down by the Government of India (in such cases as the one under reference) and to forward copies of memorial and letters marked A B & C to Your Excellency and praying at the same time that Your Excellency will cause a thorough inquiry to be instituted into the following particulars.

(a) The statement contained in letters and memorial

Enclosures
Copy of memorial marked A
" letter & S.E. B
" two do to C.E. C and C1
" two do No 480 dated 25-1-97 and testimonial

BACK P.

FURTHER PAPERS.

.O.	No.	De
	3436 C	
	440	
	2	

(b) If the letters and memorial were forwarded. the ~~reas~~ reasons why the complaints made were not inquired into as laid down by Government of India Code. Rule. Vol I. Chap IV. para IV.

(c) The Petitioner having been recommended for promotion by the Superintending Engineer on or about June 95 and a being senior in service and grade, the cause why he was superseded by three juniors.

(d) If there was then any report made by Mr Sommers Eve against the Petitioner on account of which he was superseded and if so whether it was before or after the Petitioner had left on leave and the reason why a copy was not sent to the Petitioner as per Code Rule Chap IV. para 55.

(e) If the Petitioner during the short period of six months he was in the Bellary Division, did anything contrary to the rules of the Department as laid down in Vols I & II P.W. Code or if an entry was made in the defaulter book as laid down in Chap IV, para 58. Vol I

(f) What fault did Petitioner commit in order to be fined Rs 63/ of his Travelling allowance for September 95

(g) The authority under which the above fine was inflicted

(h) If Petitioner had committed a fault for which the fine was inflicted, the cause why the fine after 9 months had been refunded.

(k) The authority under which Petitioner's pay was retrenched to the extent of Rs 427-9-0 at one instalment thereby leaving Petitioner and his family without means for three months as pointed out in letter B.

(l) The rules of retrenchment laid down by Government in Vol II, Chap III para 106 that no retrenchment should be made for three months so as to allow the officer time to appeal to Government and that if the appeal should not be successful, retrenchment would commence in the 4th month when not more than a quarter of the officer's pay could be retrenched out of each month's pay.

(m) If the Petitioner in his letter dated 11th April had not appealed against the retrenchment, which appeal has not yet been disposed of and yet the Petitioner was retrenched the full amount at once and thus Petitioner was left nearly for four months with his wife and 9 children without anything to fall back upon.

That Your Petitioner having drawn Your Excellency's attention to the points above referred to and

and mentioned at length in the memorial and letters
Copies of which are herewith submitted to Your Excellency
begs also to lay before Your Excellency copies of testimonials
from the several officers he served under in the P.W.D.,
testifying to the manner in which Your Petitr. has
been serving in the Department.

That Your Petitioner in conclusion begs leave to state
that he has been serving Her Majesty's Government
from the time that he was twelve years old at
which time he was a soldier in General Neil's
Regiment one of which composed General Havelock's
column at the Indian Mutiny where Your Petitioner
was present (as could be seen from the service register)
and that after such long and faithful service without
a single entry in the Defaulter's Book, feels extremely
grieved to find that he should have been treated by
a mere junior in the manner shown above.

That Your Petitioner most humbly begs Your Excellency
to take his case into Your Excellency's kind consideration
and that as a favour he be transferred to the
Military Works from which he was transferred in
1891 as will be seen from copy of order enclosed.
For which act of Kindness Your Petitioner as
in duty bound will pray.

Your Petitioner begs to subscribe himself as
Your Excellency's most obedient Servant.

(Sd) F. Kelly
Asst. Engineer

True copy
F. Kelly
Asst Engineer

Bangalore
21st Decemb

Through Sub. Division and Executive

To

The Hon'ble Col. J. Pennycuick R. E., C.S.I., C.I.E.
Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Madras

Copy

The humble Memorial of
Lieut. J. Kelly. Asst: Engr
P. W. D.

Sheweth,

That your Memorialist was transferred sometime in March last from the Trichinopoly to the Bellary Division, for the reason, as stated in the letter of Mr Hughes, the Superintending Engineer, dated 13th of that month, that a junior was plac in charge of the Division.

2. That, on reporting his arrival at Bellary your Memorialist had a note shown to him by the Accountan of Mr Sommers Eve, the Executive Engineer, expres in the following terms:- If Mr Kelly arrives before my return hand him the Sooqur papers to check B. Measurements.

3. That on the said papers being handed to your Memorialist he started almost immediately for his destination, depending on his cartman to convey him to the exact spot. These brought your Memorialist to a village called "Bagavada" near Doda Soogn where he found himself at the end of a channel but the plans for his guidance were missing. The Kurnam of the village however, on inquiry, pointed out to your Memorialist the proposed line of Chann and the latter set about taking the levels. In this way your Memorialist got over the fields of two villages; but when he came to the third village

safety and as the next best course suggest

Q 2

PAPERS.

B.

of could give your
or motion or assistance. This was about the
April, by which time your Memorialist had spent a
the little money he had with him, in paying for cooli
and carmen; and taking advantage of the Easter holi
your Memorialist returned to Bellary, which, at the time,
in the absence of any instructions to the contrary, he
honestly believed to be his head Quarters, to draw his
salary for the previous month, to get an imprest and
to consult the Executive Engineer, with regard to the
missing plans:- On the 13th your Memorialist received
cheque for his pay and an imprest; but owing to the b
being closed for the Easter holidays he was not able to
cash same until it reopened for business on the 17th of
the same month.

4. That on the 28th April when your Memorialist was in
Camp he received an official memo No 1792 / 20-4-95 from Mr
Sommers Eve, the Executive Engineer intimating to your
Memorialist among other things (a) that your Memorialist
had no right whatsoever to proceed to Bellary without
permission; (b) that the explanations about the plans could
have been done by means of a report (c) that your Memorialist
should explain, how many days he had been absent from
his work and the Executive Engineer would then deal with
the matter (d) that your Memorialist's excuse for remaining
in Bellary, until the Bank was open was noted and
would be further commented on; (e) that Surungapet
was the present head quarters of your Memorialist;
And lastly (f) that your Memorialist should fully
appreciate the fact that he had been sent to Mr
Sommers Eve with anything but a satisfactory character.

That to the Executive Engineer's letter which will be
found carefully analysed in the para last preceding
your Memorialist replied by his letter No 9 / 8-5-95 which
r Memorialist craves leave may be taken and read
part and parcel of this his memorial, and in
h your Memorialist gives detailed and exhaustive
planations on all the controverted points.

t with reference to that part of Mr Sommers Eve's
tter reflecting on your Memorialist's character, Your Memo-
list called on that officer to furnish your Memorialist
h a copy of that report - if any - touching his character

dition of any sort ... and keep his
your Memorialist could put up and keep
safety and as the next best course suggested
... Md. he ... ought to fix his ...

character to enable him to take steps to clear himself
any slur.

7. That in reply to the last portion of your Memorialist's
letter No 1 Mr Sommers Eve by his demi-official dated 10-5-
5-95 wrote to your Memorialist to say that when he stated that
"your Memorialist had come to him with an unsatisfactory
character, he meant as a workman"; and that in the same
letter the Executive Engineer adopted the questionable
recommending your Memorialist not to press the ques
or he should feel obliged to write to Surgeon
officially for a statement as the cause of your
recent illness. But when you Memorialist insi
8. hazards upon being furnished with a copy
relative to his character Mr Sommers Eve se
in with the answer "No report was received

8. That from the Executive Engineer's letter it a
the attitude assumed by him in regard to yo
was from the very beginning more that of a pede
towards a truant school boy, than that of one
Government placed in authority towards another
Government, holding the rank of an Assistant Eng
the P. W. D: and the baseless aspersion against
Memorialist's character, which the same letter c
and to which reference is made in the preceding
for its recklessness and utter disregard for truth, s
astounding.

9. That in his letter No 9 already referred to, you
brought to the notice of the Executive Engineer 8-5-95 Surve
was a plan unfit for head quarters, as it ha
dation of any sort in the way of a house o
you Memorialist could put up and keep
safety and as the next best course sug
convenient to fix

12. That in compliance with the Executive E

On taking over charge I pointed out the

Mistake made in the [illegible]

and after he had completed checking the levels removed to the village indicated as his head quarters, and there remained under tent; but the pain in the eyes becoming unbearable your Memorialist was compelled to apply to the nearest Medical Officer for treatment, who after prescribing for your Memorialist recommended him to keep in-doors and not expose himself to the heat of the sun. This was on the 3rd May. On the following day the same Medical Officer considered your Memorialist's case so serious that he ad the latter to see the District Surgeon at Bellary at on and forward to that office a statement of your Mem case and treatment.

11. That your Memorialist accordingly proceeded to under Medical advice, saw the District Surgeon the 6th May, and came under his treatment. day your Memorialist received a demi-official letter the Executive Engineer taking him to task for Bellary without giving him previous intimation your Memorialist to see him at his residence at 4 day. In compliance with such orders your Memor called on the Executive Engineer at the time deno informed him, that "he, your Memorialist had be to him to be cleared out of the Department: the Pennycuick did not leave these matters (meaning like your Memorialists transferring to Mr Burlto did them himself, that he, Mr Sommers Eve was brute, that he knew your Memorialist must hav and felt for him; but that he had instructions After communicating all this unpleasant matter Memorialist, under pretence of confidence Mr Eve pressed him to send in his app at once.

12. That in compliance with the Executive Engineer to tell your memorialist he "would suffer for this" could any man ca

B 2

On taking over charge I pointed out the
Mistake made in the laying out of Some

informed Mr Sommers Eve, that his letter to the District
Surgeon was misleading in as much as he was fully aw
of the circumstances, under which your Memorialist had go
to Bellary, to see the District Surgeon viz:- on the advice of the
Medical Officer at Sungappet.

14. That notwithstanding your Memorialists ill health he was
ordered off again to his head quarters to go over the ba
during an intolerably hot season of the year, for no p
reason that your Memorialist could judge, except as a
punishment; and your Memorialist seeing there was no
for it, was obliged to proceed to Sungappet in obedient
Orders.

15. That your Memorialist was next ordered to Pennahona
to work under a Sub Divisional Officer, and that it a
while on duty here. You Memorialist met the Superint
Engineer, who, informing your Memorialist that he
recommended him for promotion advised the advis
cancel his application for furlough forthwith
which your Memorialist was not slow in follow
Your Memorialist availed himself of the opport
inform the Superintending Engineer of all that
Sommers Eve had told him about the secret in
he had received "to clear your Memorialist on
Department.

16. That your Memorialist formally applied for a can
of his furlough, sending the Superintending Engine
copy of his letter and the same was accordingly com
and that in regard to these circumstances, your
has to remark, that when, later on, he met Mr. S
Eve, sometime in August, the latter had the
to tell your Memorialist, "that he - your Ma
would suffer for this" - could any man ca
for it?

over

17. Now, even granting that the above statem
that I having

On taking over charge I pointed out the
Mistake made in the

use the bare ground for a seat and a box for a table. In
No 247 asked for a travelling map which was urgently
6-8-95
wanted. The application received no response notwithstanding
your Memorialist's reminder No 336 18-9-95.
In 270 your Memorialist requested that his pay cheque
18.8.95
might be made out Bellary, where his family then resided.
No notice being taken of this your Memorialist was
obliged to write a second letter No 326 demanding to
16.9.95
the reason for not complying with his request in this
In 339 your Memorialist asked the Sub Divisional
26.9.95
to inspect a Tank 7 miles from the latter's head quarters
and give instructions as to the closing of a breach. No
notice was taken of this communication. On the following
month your Memorialist inspected the Tank himself and
in his Ten day Report remarked "Breach. waiting
instruction

18. That your Memorialist on taking charge of his duties at
Pennakonda made observations in his notes on each work
hand, pointing out the buildings that were incorrectly
out; the indifferent execution of the work, and the bad
materials used, contrary to those provided for in the
and for this your Memorialist was plainly told by
Sommers Eve at Gooty in August last, that he must
not make any remarks in the future. On another
your Memorialist ordered boulders to be removed
a building under construction the estimate for which
provided 1st Class rubble; and noted the fact in his
Ten day Report, whereupon Mr Sommers Eve
down on your Memorialist and in an endorsement
sent to the latter remarked as follows:- "I do not
allow Mr Kelly give orders to dismantle without
approval." So your Memorialist's hands were
prepare the foregoing orders, he could

3. Now, even granting that the above statements

On taking over charge I pointed out the

20. That furthermore the Sub Divisional officer that your Memorialist was not pushing on with the works and that he would be recommended for reduction in the next Annual Yearly Report. In respect of the matter Your Memorialist fails to see how he is to blame. All works are given out on contract by the Executive Engineer or regular contract bonds entered into with contractors and no one under the rank of an Executive Engineer is able to accept or annul a contract, and again, if a contractor does not push on with his work your Memorialist can only bring the matters to the notice of his Superior officer, and it is for the Executive Engineer to fine the Contractor or cancel the contract made with him and make other arrangements. Your Memorialist has treated exhaustively of this subject quoting the Government Orders thereon in his letter No 418 9. 11. 95 to the address of the Sub Divisional Officer.

21. That in para 19 supra reference is made to the Sub Divisional officer's remarks on your Memorialist's 22 day Report "That no mention is made of bad [illegible] This was in connection with the terrace work of a certain building, which was carried out in accordance with the general specification issued by Government which was to the following effect:- "Terracing to be composed of brick on edge in mortar formed of lime and sand; over this, concrete to be used and finished concrete flat tiles and plaster." But the Sub Divisional Officer wanted to know why bricks were not used on edge and sand was not used with the bricks on edge and sand was not used with the [illegible] Your Memorialist's answer was:- (vide; his letter No 418 9. 11. 95 already referred to) that if the Sub Divisional Officer had given the orders [illegible] but as your Memorialist [illegible] the Department.

3. Now, even granting that the above statements [illegible]

surely could not affect retrospectively what had alrea
had been done.

23. That about the middle of September your Memorialist received orders to commence measuring works in the Anantapur, Gooty and Todpatri Telangs while his head quarters were at Pennakonda, on the 20th of the month and submit all bills by the 26th. This he could not possibly do in view of the distance to be trav in measuring the works, the time taken in the calculations and preparations of measurement in duplicate, and bills with full details for each work, besides having to keep office copies of the sa Nevertheless your Memorialist was able to send in bills before the end of the month. But the Sub Divis Officer was not satisfied with the explanation submi He recommended that half the amount of your Memorialist's travelling allowance for the month September 1895 or Rupees 66 should be disallowe for non submission of bills in time. This cha as was to be expected was approved by Mr Eve; and your Memorialist's letter demanding know what bills he had failed to submit re unanswered. Surely it could not be seriously m that the delay of 3 or 4 days at the very ut which under the circumstances was inevita far prejudiced the course of public busines nothing short of a stoppage of a moiety of Memorialist's travelling allowance could for it.

24. That your Memorialist can honestly and Say that there has been no scampering of part; and that a reference to his town the Department on circuit 3rd

B

Bangalore
12th August 1896

Sub Engineer, who was sent from Kurnool in order to relieve your Memorialist, when his furlough, since cancelled, was first gazetted and Mr Supervisor Govinda Row, who joined the Division recently.

28. That your Memorialist has served Her Majesty's Government 38 years, during 27 years of which, he has been in the P.W.D. and that during his whole service in the Department he has not had one bad entry against his name in the Defaulter book, nor has he been in any single instance fined, censured or reduced, while his character and abi have always been above reproach as may be seen from the testimonials of his Superior officers, amongst whom were some of the ablest and most distinguished Officers of the Department. But what must be the state of your Memorialist's feelings, when in spite of all this, he shou find himself towards the close of his long and honorab career in the Department, treated as a Galley slave persecuted, threatened, annoyed, needlessly insulted b his fair fame aspersed, and his professional knowled and ability called in question by Mr Sommerville and his faithful henchman the Sub Divisional O

29. Your memorialist therefore replying on the imparti justice which has characterised your administ of the Department craves leave to express a hope his humble ~~servant~~ memorial will receive your due considera All that he seeks is justice and this he feels sur will obtain at your hands. Begging to be par for taking up your valuable time, your Memori begs to subscribe himself.

Your most obedient serv

B

Bangalore
12th August 1896

From
Lieut. J. Kelly
Asst. Engineer

To
The Superintending Engineer
III Circle
Bellary.

Copy.

This letter contains new subject-matter. Attention is drawn at letter dated 22nd inst.

Sir,

I beg leave to bring to your notice, that the letters I wrote to you on the 9th 12th 18th and 22nd of November '95 complaining of the harsh treatment I received at the hands of Mr Sommers Eve, have been as yet favoured with a reply and that the memorial dated 21st December '95 submitted with the copies of the above letters enclosed therein have also been dealt with in the same manner.

Letters of 12th 18th & 22nd nov. not received.

2. I beg also to inform you that I submitted these letters and memorial through Mr Sommers Eve (although being on leave from the 15th November I could have sent letters and memorial after that date direct to you and the Chief Engineer) thinking that as they were complaints against him it was nothing but fair to afford him a chance of remarking the statements therein made from which I expected the following few (a) that I was sent to Mr Sommers Eve with a very unsatisfactory character (b) that I neglected Mr Sommers Eve received orders to clear me from the Department.

3. Now, even granting that the above statements were correct that I have been guilty of [illegible] no reply.

Again I was reported for not pur[illegible]

further for a copy of the report to that effect, viz
as a workman, he should have denied the existenc
of a report altogether; that further, even admitting
there were such reports I and II from the Superinten
Engineer, it would have been a gross inconsistency
the part of that officer to recommend me for prom
and that besides such statements as I and II m/f, I be
by Mr Sommers Eve would only cast a great slur
the good name of Colonel Pennycuick and that on
other hand, the mere fact of the Superintending Engs
having recommended me for promotion goes only to co
the Statement of Mr Sommers Eve that there was no
at all.

4. Further, I beg to state that I was compelled to put
my application for leave, by Mr Sommers Eve, in spite
of my having represented to him by a letter, of my inability
to do so at the time owing to pecuniary difficulties, spite
the leave applied for was in the course of a month's pay
duly sanctioned, and that before being relieved how
was asked by the Superintending Engineer to can
leave who told me at the same time that he rec
me for promotion (a thing which the Superintend
Engineer would never have done if I was a man
bad character sent expressely to be cleared out of t
Department.)

5. I beg also to bring to your notice that Mr Somm
greatly annoyed at my having cancelled the leave
compliance with the request of the Superintending
has ever since been trying systematically to mak
as unpleasant as possible to me and that I w
any murmur or complaint put up as best I, explain
with that treatment dealt out to me by hinder by
would have continued to do but for the so should h
of my wife at the time (that my wife w twice and
last three months suffering fr mal

8. I beg would also to call your attention to
of the Government of India, that pronou

no reply.

again I was re ted for not pu

and that therefore I was put to the necessity of wr
directly to Colonel Pennycuick on the subject, who, with
any delay granting my request, telegraphed that I should
be relieved at once. (a thing which Colonel Pennycuick would
never have done if I was a man with bad character sent
expressly to be cleared out of the Department).

6. This kind action on the part of Colonel Pennycuick, I b
leave to represent to you, seems to have only resulted
increasing his animosity against me for after leaving
Division he has been annoying and worrying me in di
ways; for instance, my pay for the first fifteen days
November was not drawn till after the holidays in Jan
that from the 16th to the 30th November, and from
the 1st to the 31st December, was not drawn till Fe
that of January, was drawn in March, that no pay w
drawn for the months of February, March and April a
131 Rs only were drawn as being the balance of pay d
from 16/11/95 to 30/4/96 after deducting what was
Besides witholding my pay he kept back 63 Rs of
travelling allowance of the months of September, Oc
month of May i.e. for full 9 months.

7. This kind of annoyance and worry which he caused
the few months I was working in his Division, I beg
he has been keeping up ever after I left. For in
promotions lately made in the grade of Sub Engi
my claims have been overlooked and I have been s
by no less than three juniors - from which fact
that Mr Sommers Eve must have made a report
me, because otherwise it is impossible to explain
senior like myself who was recommended by
Superintending Engineer for promotion should
superseded by three juniors in service and

8. I beg leave also to call your attention to
of the Government of India, that promoti

these rulings of the Government of India there has not been one single occasion on which I misconducted myself nor any entry was made against me in the Defaulters' book and that on the other hand I can produce testimonials from some of the ablest officers that served in the Madras Public Works Department

10. I beg also to remind you of the Code rule according which all complaints should be enquired into and the rule I beg to inform you has in my case been complet ignored and that instead, I have been condemned un defamed in character, and ruined in my prospects.

11. I beg also to draw your attention to the fact that M Sommers Eve has laid himself open to a charge of defamation and that we both being Government Serv a charge of the kind cannot be framed against him without the sanction of the Government.

12. I humbly beg to submit this letter direct to you not through the Executive Engineer, through whom the letters and memorial above referred to and w have not been yet favoured with a reply, reques at the same time to be good enough to favour m the copies of reports made against me by Mr. Eve, I humbly implore that a thorough enquiry b and full justice be meted out to me.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obedient ser

(Sigd) J. Kelly

no reply.

Again I was re ted for not

C

Bangalore
14th May 1896

From
Hon Lieut. J. Kelly
Asst. Engineer P.W.D.

To
Col. The Hon'le D. McNeil Campbell
Secretary to Government. P.W.D.
Through the Executive Engineer.

Sir

With reference to letter No. 1186 $\frac{D}{E}$ of 28th ult. from the Ex'r of P.W. Accts to the Ext. Engr. Bell Dn stating that under Rule 5 Appx 12 C.S. Regs Hony Comsd Officers are only entitled to half emoluments of their office while on leave I beg to state that this ruling does not appear to be borne out by A.R.I. Vol. I Part I.

2. In Appx C. A.R.I. Vol I. Part I it is clearly laid down that Commissioned, Hony Comsd and Assy Surgeons will draw half the emoluments of their office when on furlough, while from the following it would appear to indicate that the furlough out of India

(a) The pay of Hony Comsd Officers on leave in India is regulated by the rules applicable to Comsd Officers. They will draw staff allowance if entitled to the same.

[illegible] to arts 934 and [illegible] but receive no reply.

[illegible] I was requested for [illegible]

(d) Consd Officers of the Staff corps on leave
India draw full pay and allowances for one
year, while Asst. Surgeons under the rules
of 1875 on gent leave in India, draw house
rent in addition to full pay and allowan
vide art: 905 which refers to 934-945.

3. The above are cases in which staff pay and
allowances are passed contrary to the rule Can
cited by the Exr P. W. Accts and would pre
sumably go to show that rule 5 Appx 12 of
the C. S. Regulations is applicable to cases
Officers on leave out of India.

4. The pay and allowances of Stowy Consd
Officers under the 1875 rules are regulated
the same manner as those of Consd St. Sr
agreeably to art. 902 A.R.I. Vol I Pt C.
Appx C ibid and it appears to me the
I am entitled to the pay and allowance
indicated in art. 935 (ii) as I was
12 months leave on Medical certifica
the furlough rules of 1875 but as the
is of a different opinion I solicit the
of you referring the point to the Adjt
Army Hd Qrs for consideration

Signed J. Kelly
Asst Engr

copy

no reply.

Again I was

C 1

Bangalore
24th July 1896

From Lieut. J. Kelly
Asst: Engineer

To.
Col. The Hon'ble D. McNeil CB
Chief Engineer. P.W. Dept.

This was handed to me by Lieut Somerville 20/11/96

Sir,

Referring to your No. 2787 / 16-7-96 I beg to state the rule referred to in the above No. applies equally to Comsd, H. Comsd, and Asst. Surgs on leave out of India vide Appx C.1 I.A.R. which I quoted in my letter of the 8th inst.

2. In support of this I quoted (in the same four cases where Commissioned Officers as Surgeons, when on leave in India, under rules, draw pay and allowances and half pay vide arts 69 m, 710, 905, and 720 Vol II Army Regulations.

3. I also pointed out that the pay and allowances of Hony C. Officers on leave in India is regulated in the same manner as C. Officers vide art. 902 Vol I. I.A.R.

4. From the above it is clear that if C. Officers on leave in India under 1875 are entitled to what ever allowances Hony Comsd Officers receive

Rs 300

no reply.

Again I was requested for my

Ootacamund
26 January 1891

To The Executive Engineer
Madras Division

Sir

I have the honor to request that Conductor J. Kelly, Sub Engineer, may be relieved of his duties in your division as soon as possible and directed to report himself to the Secretary to Government of Madras in the P.W. Dept. for re-employment in that Department

I have &c
(Signed) Bertram A.G. Skelly Lt
For Chief Engineer, Madras

No. 536
30-1-91

Copy to Conductor J. Kelly for information

You will hand over charge of all work outside the fort to Sub Conductor Cloy as soon as possible — Submitting the usual papers

J Herbert Mullaly
Asst Engineer

Rs 300

no reply.

TESTIMONIALS.

...s is to certify that Overseer J. KELLY has served under me in the Visagapatam Dis-
while in charge of the Govada & Poodamadaka roads, that I believe him to be of perfect
est character, that he has been very industrious and efficient in the discharge of his duties.
I feel great satisfaction in giving this testimonial, for, although he did know his work at
irst, he improved remarkably afterwards ; and I fully believe he will persevere and be an use-
ful member in the D. P. W.

M. C. S. WEST,
Supervisor.

Ellore. 23—4—72.

Sergeant J. KELLY, Taluq Overseer of Vellore has been working under my immediate orders since April 1876. I have formed a high opinion of his industry, intelligence, trustworthyness and general conduct. As regards his professional capability, ordinary works of the Taluq have been performed by him in a most satisfactory manner, and some especially large building works, including an elaborate drainage scheme for the Central Jail, have been successfully completed under his supervision.

C. VINCENT.
Asst. Engineer, Vellore Division.

Vellore, 24th January 1878.

Sergeant KELLY has been Overseer in the Vellore Taluq, while I have been Dist. Engineer for the last two years. He has done his works well. And his conduct and character have been excellent. I have recommanded Sergeant Kelly for promotion to Warrant rank.

H. L. PRENDEGAST,
Lieut. Colonel, District Engineer,

Vellore, 20th October 1878.

SERGT. KELLY,

I have much pleasure in sending you the revolver which I brought for you from England and which I hope you will accept from me as a token ef remembrance of the excellent way in which you have worked under me more especially during the very trying famine years of 77 & 78.

I am,
Sincerely yours,
CLAUDE VINCENT.

Vellore, 11th January 1879.

To Mr. KELLY.

The Duke was very much pleased with the Temple and told me repeatedly that he considered it has been most well, and carefully done. I am thinking that the praise I have got is in a great measure due to you. He insists on having the gates restored and wishes it done before he goes.

D. Mc. CAMPBELL,
Capt. R. E. Ext. Engineer.

Vellore, 18th November 1880.

Copy of letter to the Major HOBART, Military Secretary to his Grace the Duke of Buckingham.

My Dear Major HOBART.

Will you kindly inform his Grace that the gates of the pagodan have been restored and that they now can be opened and shut by one man with case. The work was more troublesome than I anticipated as each gate weighed nearly three tons and the wood work was very sotten it would not have been finished within the time I promised his Grace it would be had it not been for the exertion and ability of my Overseer Mr. Sub Conductor KELLY who remained on the work from morning till night during its process and to whom therefore the credit of the restoration is chiefly due.

D. Mc. N CAMPBELL,
Capt. R. E. Executive Engineer,
Vellore Division.

...ellore, 29th Nov. 1880.

...r. Sub conductor J. KELLY Supervisor has served under me for more than two years and ...that time he has given complete satisfaction : he is active, steady and hardworking. ...ld be an excellent ma...n to supervise the carrying of large masonry works.

1941
No 407
11-11-95

From,
Lieut J. Kelly
Assistant Engineer

To,
The Superintending Engineer
iii Circle
Bellary

Thro:
The Sub Divisional Officer
Anantapur

Camp Gooty
Encs
Dt 9th November 1895
Rd

Sir,

Before replying to Mr: Somerset's
5432 Dt 4-11-95, I beg to bring the foll...
few facts to your notice from which you
see how I have been treated from the ...
I joined this Division.

On being transferred from Trichinopa...
Mr Hughes sent me a note informing m...
transfer was owing to a junior ...
Charge of the Division. On rep...
no reply.

Dated 12-11-95
Received this
12
14/12
Forwarded for disposal
Bellary
12-11-95
No 121
G.95 W.D. DIVISION ENGINEER
18/12
Rs 300

with a very Unsatisfactory Character
that my Head Quarters would be one of the
village on the borders of the Nizam's territory.
I asked for a copy of the report touching my
Character, also for permission to make my
Head-Quarters near the work but where there
was an Inspection shed, which latter was not
granted, and I was obliged in the hottest time
of the year to remain in a Small tent.
Having Completed Checking levels which I
found to be pretty Correct, I went to the
village which was fixed as my Head Quarters
and remained there as ordered.
Having Suffered Considerably from levelling
the great heat of the Sun, especially in
the eye and having nothing to do I thought
advisable to call in the assistance of a
Medical man and Sent for the nearest
advised me not to Expose myself, not to read
After being under this Medical
treatment for a few days I

On taking over charge I pointed out the
Mistake

Surgeon I could go out and, to call at his
Head Quarters. I did So (and then was the first
time Mr: Somerset said me) when Mr Somerset
me told me he had orders to "clear me
out of the Department" and to Send in my
application for furlough. In a letter
I pointed out that owing to being in debt
was not able to go, but Sent in my applica
as ordered.
While waiting for Sanction of leave I w
nothing out drawing in the Executive Engineer
offier when I received a D. O; not to file
for a reply regarding the report on my
Character: If I did Mr. Somerset would
write officially to the District Surgeon at
me. I insisted on having a copy and
Mr Somerset wrote to the Dist Surgeon
that "I had Come in to Bellary Staged
that I was in Urgent need of a Medical
"advice" to Corroborate the Same" receive
out to Mr S. me that he
again I was re

to Bellary).

Mr Sommerset then ordered me to go out again and Check the levels a 2nd time. While not Checking I received a reply (to my first letter asking for a copy or report touching my Character) that Mr Sommerset meant "unsatisfactory as a workman". On receipt of which I asked for a copy of the report to that effect. and again received a reply in July, "there was no report". — Vide 10.

Meeting the Superintending Engineer during my works he told me, I had better resign my leave if I did not Care for it. I told the Superintending Engineer what Mr Sommerset told me about "Clearing me out of the Department". S. E. told me I had recommended me for promotion | ? why not?
that I had better be sharp and gave me a hint to address. I accordingly had my

On taking over charge I pointed out the Mistake made in the laying out of some buildings as also in the materials and workmanship to that in tenders and provided for in Estimate. I was told by Mr Sommerset — Ever not to make remarks.

On another occasion I ordered boulders to be removed from a building under Construction, the Estimate for which provided 1st Class Coursed Rubble and I received an order "Mr Kelly is not to give order without the Approval of the S. O.".

I received an order to Commence measuring works in three talugs while my Head Quarters is in a fourth, and to submit all bills by the 25th which I Could not possibly do but managed to submit all before the end of the month — See clerk's Explanation — and was recommended to be fined Rs 66 for neglect to submit bills in time. I asked what bills were not submitted but received no reply.

Again I was ordered to go out from the

Why not! || Because the bills were not received before the 25th as ordered, in time to be checked. Rs 300

with that he would be glad to dispense with my Service altogether not wishing to retain me by urgency stating he is shorthanded.

In addition to the treatment pointed out above I beg to state that since joining this Sub Division I never get salary till about the 10th, Some times on the 14th, to day is the 9th and I have not received October Salary nor Travelling allowance for September & October.

I have borne with all without a murmour or Complaint as it Concerns myself and would Continue to bear the annoyance but now that it's a question of the health and perhaps the life of my wife I am bound to bring the treatment I have received to your notice and that you will please take early steps to grant me leave and to have my pay and travelling allowance paid.

I have the honor to be
Sirs
Your most obedt Servt
C. K.

Ex 47 Sept/96

Once owing to Early beg in Murmat. I rec'd my salary on the 13th
Salary for October was sent on the 8th Mr Kelly informed to accept his T.A. for Sept. became half was withheld. T.A. for October is not yet audited.
C300.

Public Works (1896) Department.

Ex 48

CURRENT No. 8246
10742/96

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, Regr. No. ..... IIIrd CIRCLE, BELLARY, P.W.D.

3/5548 Copy 11/96.

Order

No. 3436 C d/24th Septr 1896

Referred, in continuation of No. 3435 C d/24th Septr 1896. the Supdg Engineer III Circle for report.

Dated 10th Septr.
Received 12 ..
Enclosures 5
Spare copies

From H. A. Stuart Esqre. Sprole Secy to Govt

No. (Dy Secy)

Dear Campbell Colonel M
no 1938 d/2-9-96 Asst Secretary
Forwarded to the Exe: Engr Bellary Dy for report in continuation of this Offce Nos 1930 dated 30-9-96 and 1937 d/2nd October 96
for Executive Engineer
Superintg 29.9.96

SUBJECT.

Transfer Enclosure to a petition dated 29th Augt 1896 from Lt J Kelly Asst Engr Bungalore

P.W.D. BELLARY DIVISION

repat me

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Enclosures file - Memo No 1604 dt 28.8.96 from S.E. III Circle

Cu 5029

Bangalore
6th September 1896

From
Lieut J. Kelly
Asst Engineer

To
Col the Hon'ble D McNeil Campbell
Chief Engineer

Sir

In continuation of my petition to H.E. the Governor I beg leave to bring to your notice the memo No 1604 28-8-96 I received from the Supt Engineer III Circle & to its enclosure from which you will at once see that my letter dated 9th November 95 to the address of the Supt Engineer together with my memorial dated 21st Dec '95 complaining of the harsh treatment I received at the hands of Mr Sommers have not been forwarded at all and that not content with suppressing them, he has gone to the length of remarking in the Recommendation Role of 31st Dec '95, & reiterating the same again in the R. Roll of 30th June '96, as follows - (1) Conduct unsatisfactory (2) Capabilities poor or not utilized (3) wanting in push and energy (4) obstructs contractors

These remarks of Mr Sommers are contain serious charges reflecting against my character and capabilities and as such demand an immediate refutation. Before however I begin to refute the charges seriatim I beg to bring to your notice that dispite the very serious nature of these charges, and the Code rule as well as the Chief Engineers Circular No 853 C dated 6th March 95, Mr Sommers has kept me in ignorance of them, by not conde-

d/386

G.O. | No. | Department. | Date.

of the report he made in the Recommendation Rolls. This gross violation of the code rules as well as Chief Engrs' Circulars in having kept back all information of the Reports made against me is a matter which I beg to lay before you for your consideration.

In refuting the first charge of 'unsatisfactory conduct' I beg to state that taking the words 'unsatisfactory conduct' to refer to my character as a workman, the numerous testimonials from several Officers of experience, Generals & Col Pennycuick being among the number, go to contradict it most emphatically & that in case Mr Sommers's use meant by his remark my moral character, I can without the slightest difficulty disprove the truth of the charge by a simple reference to the clergy of all the dioceses from one extream corner of Madras Presidency to the other, who would will without the least hesitation unanimously testify to my moral character for the last 25 years.

2 In regard to the second charge levelled at me by Mr Sommers's viz that my capabilities are poor or not utilized I simply beg to state that it gives the direct lie to the several experienced Officers who have spoken of my powers in terms of unqualified praise and approval.

3 As to the accusation that I am wanting in push and energy I beg leave to draw your attention to the following facts which speak for themselves and will show you the utter baselessness & falsity of the remark made against me by Mr Sommers viz

First I beg to refer you to the work of restoring the Temple gates at Vellore, which your predecessors Captain Dobson, Hamilton, and Pennycuick did not like to undertake owing to the perilous risk incidental to the undertaking and which you promised the late Governor Duke of Buckingham to complete within ten days and accordingly put me in sole charge in order to make good your promise.

Secondly I beg to state that in 1892 when I was ordered to [illegible]

five lines of railways in N. West District which Major Dawson reported would take a man two years to do, I completed it in six months a work of considerable dimensions considering I had to go over an area of nine Talugs besides the Zemaundaries, Thirdly I beg to submit that the work of restoring the Red Hills tank at an expenditure of Rs 1.69 000 was completed by me as S.D. Officer in ten months and during the time the town of Madras was kept fully supplied with water — These facts most assuredly, I beg to state do not show any want of skill and energy on my part as can be seen from Col. Pennycuick's report and the Govt. Order there on

Then again I beg to refer you to the report of Mr Walsh Supt.g Engineer I Circle report on the Construction of the road (21 miles) over the Jeypore hills (estimated to cost 3 lacs in which I was in sole charge) in which he particularly mentions my skill and energy and an entire refutation of the charges of want of energy

The fourth charge viz. that I obstruct Contractors and piece-workers I beg to state is one of unmitigated absurditily as could be clearly seen from the following especially when it is taken into consideration that I was strictly forbidden to make any remarks whatever, about work or to give orders without the S.D. Officers approval.

First even admitting that I did obstruct Contractors and piece-workers I could have done so only by writing, the contractors and piece-workers being residents of Bellary 70 miles away from their work, which was being carried out by their Agents who certainly could not act without their Masters orders, and who would require all orders to be

their Masters, if any orde

by me they should no doubt now be produced by Mr Sommers Eve to corroborate his statement and besides it is laid down in the Code that all orders are to be in writing Vide Chap IX para 2 P.W. Code, and also para 9 of the same Chap P.W Code, that in case there should be any interruption in the works, the matter should be immediately reported to the Sup.tg Engineer and that in spite of the rule this was not done, for if it was the number and date of the report should be produced in support of the statement. I beg further to refer you to the enclosed extract of my Ten-day Report dated 29th August 195 and copy of Mr Sommer's Eve's order to the S.D. Officer which will show you how Mr Sommers Eve encouraged contractors to work, when he ordered Stone cutters paid 9 as a day to be employed in chiselling specks of Chunam that had fallen on the walls during the time of working, thus putting the contractor to the unnecessary expense of Rs 5-9-0 per day, while the same specks could have been easily removed by the simple use of soapnut and water at the cost of a few annas, and secondly, when Mr Sommers Eve ordered the S.D Officer to send to Madras a distance of 275 miles for bricks which certainly to say the least is diametrically opposed to the rules laid down in Vol I Chap VIII para 29 P.W Code — Besides I beg to inform You, viz respect — in respect to piece-workers the case of a certain individual, of parently a great favourite of Mr Sommers Eve, who got the construction of the Police Sup.tg Office Estimated @ Rs three hundred and that of a school house Estd @ Rs Cutcherry

BACK PA

G.O.	No.	De

School house and
on the 12th Gooty Cutcherry on the 17th Anantapore
Police Superintendents Office on the 21st August
'95. (4) that I left the Division on leave on the
15th November, and that between the 21st August
and 15 November, the date of my leaving
Mr Sommers Eve never saw me nor my work
- and that yet Mr Sommers Eve in his first
R. Roll 31st December '95 after I had left
the Division on leave remarked as mentioned
above and repeated the same six months
after — These facts I beg to lay before you
to consider first why it was that Mr Sommers
Eve, in case he had found any thing defe
ctive or wrong in my work, waited so long
as the 31st December i.e. long after I had left
the Division to make his report against me and
Secondly whether Mr Sommers Eve after only
three days inspection was in a fit position
to form an adequate opinion of my work or
abilities and that particularly when I was
barely a month in charge of the works and
had hardly any time at all event to become
properly acquainted with the works in
three talugs

From this I beg to submit it is quite evident
that the only reason why Mr Sommers Eve should
have remarked so bitterly and virulently against
me was because I broke absolutely his conduct, when he
refused to recommend Supdg Eve leave I applied for
(in order to remove his wife who was then lying
seriously ill and whose removal from Bellary
was medically pronounced a
necessary) to the notice of the

first and then to that of the Chief Engineer which to my greatest surprise and disappointment I now find after nine long months was entirely suppressed while at the same I have been subject to all sorts of privations and sufferings and in addition to it have been made an object of adverse criticism without any ground or basis

+ Vide S.E.S № 1604 dated 28th August 96

I most humbly pray therefore that a court of enquiry be appointed for a thorough investigation into the matter I have referred in my memorial and petition to His E. the Governor and that in this manner full justice be meted to me who have been rather too long made an unfortunate subject of the most cruel treatment that one could conceive of, at the hands of Mr Sommers &c

I beg to remain

Sir

Your Most Obedient Servant

J Kelly Lieut.
Assistant Engineer

B

Exhact from the Dist Engineers Promotion Recommendation Roll for the half year ending 31st December 1895

Kelly John Hon. Lieut and Asst Commissary, Hon. Asst Engineer 3rd Grade	Not recommended Conduct unsatisfactory - Capabilities poor or not utilized - wanting in push and energy - Obstructs rather than assists contractors and piece workers
Do	Do On furlough, but remark of last half year to prevent any chance of a mistake Conduct unsatisfactory, Capabilities poor or not utilized - wanting in push and energy - Obstructs contractors and rather than assists piece-workers

Half Year ending 30th June 1896

True extract
(Sgd) W. De Whinton
Supt Engineer
28/8/96

True copy
J. Kelly
Asst Engr

C

Ten-day Inspection Report of Lieut. J. Kelly Asst Engineer
from 21st to 31st August 1895

Date	Name of work	Remarks by Officer or Subordinate in charge	Remarks by Asst Engr or S.D. Officer
21st Augt 1895	Constructing Tolsey Cutchery at Gooty.	Ten stone cutters sent by contractor from Bellary who are employed in hammering at the walls to remove chunam specks. This constant hammering is shaking the building — Every time water is thrown on the top of the walls it brings down some chunam which runs down on the face of the walls. Showed the contractors agent an easier and cheaper method of removing chunam specks. Took a stone thickly covered with mortar which I had rubbed with a coir brush and often had painted with liquid soda and allowed to dry, when the soda was washed off there was not a speck of chunam to be seen, but as the Contractors agent cannot act without the Contractors orders who is at Bellary and who it is presumed received orders direct from the Asst Engineer, the hammering going on	(This stone was taken by me to show to the Contractors agent what the effect of removing chunam was when done by water alone, by which the mortar was not disturbed & the chunam specks remained as they were, but by the method I showed him the mortar was removed & the chunam specks also.)

Certified to be a true copy

J. Kelly

Remarks by J. Kelly

True copy
J Kelly

G.

Oct 5-2
Pass
1074 2/96

D

Copy of Endorsement of the Executive Engineer Bellary Division No. 5704/21-10-95 on S.D Officers No. 523/15-10-95 Reporting that the supply of bricks for Gooty Jeluy Cutcherry has run out

You may fine him (contractor) or Employ the money by having bricks sent from Madras (from Madras to Gooty is 275 miles) or any place you of where tenacing bricks are available

Sd/-
J.J Sommers Roe
Asst Engr

True copy
J Kelly
Asst Engr

Note

The above shows (1) there was no bricks to go on with the work (2) also that the S.D.O under whom I was working could not, or would not act on his own responsibility, and yet I, who could not do anything without authority from the S. D officer am accused of obstructing contractors and piece workers — J.K

Inspection Notes of Lieut J. Kelly Asst Engineer
from 11th to 20th September 1895

E

	Name of Work	Remarks by Officer on Subdivi. in charge	Remarks by S.E.O. or Ext Engineer
Sept 20	Constructing Police Office Anantapore	Checked foundations; ordered Maistry not to lay concrete tell corners were perfectly squared	
do	Constructing High School Anantapore	Tested portion of concrete reported by Maistry to be badly done & ordered six inches to be taken up and relaid ordered Maistry to remove all boulders found in the wall just commenced En route to Penakonda Sigd J. Kelly True copy J Kelly Asst Engr	By Ext Engr Iwill not have Mr Kelly give orders to dismantle without approval of S.D.O
	Note The Estimate for the new school provides for 1st class Coursed rubble. I found Piece workers using old boulder stone that was removed from the old school. The Ext Engr order will show that I could not prevent bad work and inferior materials being used J Kelly		

Copy

Bangalore
6th September 1896

From
Lieut. J. Kelly
Asst Engineer.

To
Col. The Honble D. McNeil Campbell
Chief Engineer.

Sir,

In continuation of my petition to H.E. the Governor I beg leave to bring to your notice the Memo No 1604 28-8-96 I received from the Superintending Engineer III Circle and to its enclosure from which you will at once see that my letter dated 9th November to the Supg Engineer and my memorial dated 21st December '95 complaining of the harsh treatment I received at the hands of Mr Sommers Eve have not been forwarded at all and that not content with suppressing them he has gone to the length of remarking in the Recommendation Roll of 31st Dec. '95 repeating the same again in the R. Roll of 30th June '96 as follows (1) conduct unsatisfactory (2) capabilities poor or not utilized (3) wanting in push and energy (4) obstructs contractors.

These remarks of Mr Sommers Eve contain serious charges reflecting against my character and capability and as such demand immediate refutation. Before however I begin to refute the charges seriatim I beg to bring to your notice that despite the very serious nature of these charges, and the Code Rule as well as the Chief Engineer's Circular No 853 C of the 6th March 1895 Mr Sommers Eve kept me in complete ignorance of them, by not sending me a copy of the report he made in the Recommendation Roll. This gross violation of the Code rules and Chief Engineer's Circular, in having kept back all infotmation of the report from me, is a matter which I beg to lay before you for

In refuting the first charge of unsatisfactory conduct, I beg to state that taking the words 'unsatisfactory conduct' to refer to my character as a workman, the numerous testimonials I received from several officers of experience, yourself and Col. Pennycuick being among the number go to contradict it most emphatically - and that in case Mr Sommers Eve meant by his remark my moral character I can without the slightest difficulty disprove the truth of the charge by a simple reference to the clergy of all the dioceses from one extreme corner of the Madras Presidency to the other, who would without the least hesitation unanimously testify to my moral character for the last 25 years.

2. In regard to the second charge levelled at me by Mr Sommers Eve that my capabilities are poor or not utilized, I simply beg to state that it gives direct lie to the several experienced officers who have spoken of my power in terms of unqualified praise and approval.

3. As to the accusation that I am wanting in push and energy, I beg leave to draw your attention to the following facts which speak for themselves and will show you the utter baselessness and falsity of the remark made against me by Mr Sommers Eve. First I beg to refer you to the work of restoring the temple gates at Vellore - which your predecessors Captains Dobson, Hamilton and Pennycuick did not like to undertake owing to the perilous risk incidental to the undertaking and which you promised the late Governor Duke of Buckingham to complete within ten days and accordingly put me in sole charge in order to make good your promise. Secondly I beg to state that in 1892 when I was ordered to submit hydraulic statements of tanks affecting five lines of railways in North Arcot District which Major Rawson reported would take a man two years to do, I completed it in six months, a work of considerable dimensions considering I had to go over an area of nine talugs besides the zemindaries. Thirdly I beg to submit that the work of restoring the Red H[illegible] tric Anan[illegible] An expenditure of Rs 160000 was comp[illegible]

as S. D. Officer in ten months and during the time the town of Madras was kept supplied with water. These facts most assuredly, I beg to state do not show any want of skill and energy on my part as can be seen from Col Pennycuick's report and the Govt order thereon.

Then again I beg to refer you to the report of Mr Welch Suptg. Engineer I Circle report on the construction of the road (21 miles) over the Jeypore hills (estimated to cost Rs 3 lacs in which I was in sole charge) in which he particularly mentions my skill and energy and an entire refutation of the charges of want of energy.

The fourth charge viz, that I obstruct contractors and piece-workers, I beg to state is one of unmitigated absurdity as could be clearly seen from the following, especially when it is taken into consideration that I was strictly forbidden to make any remarks whatever about work or to give orders without the S.D. Officer's approval.

First, even admitting that I did obstruct Contractors I could have done so only by writing, the Contractors and piece-workers being residents of Bellary 70 miles away from their work, which was being carried out by their agents, who certainly could not act without their masters orders, and who would require all orders to be sent to their masters. If any orders were issued by me they should no doubt now be produced by Mr Sommers Eve to corroborate his statement, and besides it is laid down in the Code that all orders are to be in writing vide Chap IX para 2 P. W. Code and also para 9 of the same Chapter P. W. Code, that in case there should be any interruption in the works, the matter should be immediately reported to the Suptg Engineer and that in spite of the rule this was not done, for if it was, the number and date of the report should be produced in support of the statement.

I beg further to refer you to the enclosed extract of my Ten-day Report dated 20th August 96 and Copy of Mr Sommers Eve's order to the S. D. O. which will show you how Mr Sommers Eve [illegible] the Anant contractors to work, when he ordered [illegible]

enclosure marked C

do D

paid 9as a day to be employed in chiselling specks of chunam that had fallen on the walls, during the time of working, thus putting the contractors to the unnecessary expense of Rs 5-9-0 a day, while the same specks could have been easily removed by the simple use of soap-nut and water at a cost of a few annas, and secondly, when Mr Sommers Eve ordered the S.D. Officer to send to Madras, a distance of 275 miles for bricks which certainly to say the least is diametrically opposed to the rules laid down in Vol I Chap. VIII para 29. P.W.C.

Besides I beg to inform you, in respect to piece-workers the case of a certain individual, apparently a great favourite of Mr Sommers Eve, who got the construction of the Police Supt.s Office estimated to cost about Rs30,000 and that of a School house estimated to cost about 20,000 without the usual contract bond, and this man was not ordered to employ stone-cutters to chisel chunam specks from the walls of his work.

The materials of the old dismantled school was given to him for Rs 200/ and was allowed to use some of the old stone boulders in the construction of the New School house the estimate for which provided first class coursed rubble. I, according to Code Rule Chap. VIII para 29 objected to it on the score of inferior material having been used, besides I had no authority to deviate from the sanctioned estimate at the time and made a note in my Ten-day Report from (11th to 20th Sept'95) whereupon an endorsement was received by me from Mr Sommers Eve to the effect that he would not have me give orders to dismantle without the S. D. O's approval, after which of course I could issue no orders.

Further I beg to bring to your notice as an instance of push and energy that I possess that from my Ten-day Reports and Travelling Journal it could be seen at a glance that I was in the District from the 15th of July t[illegible]

to that of the Chief Engineer which to my greatest surprise
and disappointment, I now find after 9 long months
was entirely suppressed while at the same time I have
been subjected to all sorts of privations and suffering
and in addition to it have been made an object of
adverse criticism, without any ground or basis.
I most humbly pray therefore that a court of enquiry
be appointed for a thorough investigation into the matter
I have referred in my memorial and petition to the
Governor and that in this manner full justice be
meted to me who have been rather too long made
an unfortunate subject of the most cruel treatment that
one could conceive of, at the hands of Mrs Sommers
Eve.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most Obedient Servant
(Sigd) J. Kelly Lieut
Asst Engineer

True copy
J Kelly
Asst Surgn

on S.E. No 1604
dated 28 August/96

A

No. 1604

Bellary
28th August 96

From
The Supt Engineer
III Circle
Bellary

To
Lieut J. Kelly
Asst Engineer
Bangalore

With reference to his letter dated Bangalore 12th August 1896 Lieut J. Kelly Asst Engineer is informed that the letters referred to in Para I have not been received in this office.

2 As requested in para 12 of his letter copies of the unfavourable reports upon his Conduct submitted in the last two holy Yearly Recommendation Rolls are herewith sent - These should have been supplied to him at the time by the Execut Engineer, Bellary Division in accordance with Chief Engineers Memo No 853 C of 6th March 1895

I beg to point out that this is not in accordance with the order contained in Circular No 2682 C dt 5th Sept 1895 in which it is stated that no adverse remarks should be sent after approval by the Supt Engr This was not done

J. F Sweeney

Sign. W. D. Winton
Supt Engineer III Circle

True Copy
J. Kelly
Asst Engineer

W 55/1742/96

B

Extract from the Execut Engineers
Promotion Recommendation Roll for the
half year ending 31st December 1895

Kelly John Hm Lieut. and Asst Commissary, Hm Asst Engineer 3rd Grade	Not recommended Conduct unsatisfactory Capabilities poor or not utilized Wanting in push and energy Obstructs rather than assists contractors and piece workers

Half year ending 30th June 1896

Do. — do	On furlough but remark of last half year to prevent any chance of a mistake Conduct unsatisfactory Capabilities poor or not utilized – wanting in push and energy. Obstructs rather than assists contractors and piece workers

True extract
(Sigd) W De L Hinton
Supt Engineer
28/8/96

True copy
J Kelly
Asst Engr

C

Tenday Inspection Report of Lieut J. Kelly Asst Engs

from 21st to 31st August 1895

Name of work	Remarks by Officer in Subordinate charge	Remarks by Asst Engr or S. D. Officer
Constructing Valley Cutchery at Goolgi	Ten stone cutters sent by contractor from Bellary who are employed in hammering at the walls to remove chunam specks - This constant hammering is shaking the building - Every time water is thrown on the top of the walls it brings down some chunam - which runs over the face of the walls - Showed contractors agent an easier and cheaper method of removing chunam specks. Took a stone thickly covered with mortar which I had rubbed with a dry coir brush and after had painted with liquid soda and allowed to dry when the soda was washed off, there was not a speck of chunam to be seen, but as the contractors agent is not contract-with and the contractors orders who is at Bellary and who it is presumed receives orders direct from the Asst Engr the hammering is going on -	

True copy
J. Kelly
Asst Engr

Remarks by J. Kelly (This shows neither I think to avoid the contractor or not, it also shows the Contractor an easier and cheaper method of removing chunam from stone by which he would be able to get the work done without this master hammering.) The work stopped

D

Copy of endorsement of the Exct Engineer Bellary
Division No 6704 21-10-95 On S.D Officer's No 523 15-10-95
reporting that the supply of bricks for Govt Valay
Cutcherry has run out

You may fine him (contractor) or employ the
money by having bricks sent from Madras
(From Madras to Govt 275 miles) or any place you know
of where tenacious bricks are available

Sd.
J.J Sommers Eve
Exct Engr

True copy
J Kelly
Asst Engr

Note. The above shows (1) there was no bricks
to go on with work, (2) also that the S.D.O
under whom I was working could not or
would not act on his own responsibility
and yet I, who could not do anything
without authority from the S.D officer
am accused of obstructing contractors and
piece workers. JK

L 0 E

Ten-day Report of Lieut J. Kelly Asst Engineer from
1st to 21st September 1895

From 1st to date	Name of work	Remarks by officer or Subwonds	Remarks by Asst Engr or S.D. Officer
21st Sept	Constructing Police Officer Anantapore	Checked foundations, ordered maisiry not to lay Concrete till corners were perfectly squared	
do	Constructing High School Anantapore	Tested portion of concrete reported by maistry to be badly done - ordered five inches to be taken up and relaid - Ordered maistry to remove all boulders found in the walls just commenced -	By Asst Engr I will not have Mr Kelly give orders to dismantle without approval of S.D.

En route to Penakonda

Sigd J. Kelly
Asst Engr

True copy

J Kelly
Asst Engr

Note

The Estimate for the new Sch ol provides for 1st class coursed rubble / found nice workable using old boulder stone that was removed from the old School

The Asst Engr order will show that I could not prevent bad work and inferior materials being used - JK

L.O. No 239

Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 10021

Order

Await further report from the Supt. Cowan

10/11/96

W

Cir

CWH 10.11.96

From The Superintg Engineer Polairelle Bella

No. 2406 W.

Dated 3rd November 1896

Received 6.11.96

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Mrs Kelly's petition

Forwards copy of Executive Engineers letter stating that the replies will be forwarded in about 4 days.

9703

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Letter from J. F. Somers Esqr., Esstt., Executive Engineer, Bellary Division, No. 6189 dated 2nd November 1896 to the Secrty. Engineer, III Circle.

With reference to your Reminder No. 2352 of 31st October 1896, I have the honour to state that replies to Mr. Kelly's petetions will be forwarded in about 4 days.

It is a lengthy business and what with His Excellency the Governor's visit and the impending scarcity, my Office and myself have been so fully occupied that I have been unable to do more than devote 2 days to it, and another 3 will be required.

No. 2406 W dt 3 November 1896.

Communicated to the Chief Engineer, P.W. Department with reference to his reminder No. 3435C dated 30th October 1896. The papers will be despatched from this Office as early as possible after their receipt.

* with Acc. 97 dt 3 memo on 6-11-96 and not numbered yet

J. Beckinton

Secrty. Engineer, III Circle.

K.S.
3-11-96.

Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 10742

Order

From

The Superintending Engineer
III Circle
Bellary

No. 26634

Dated 23rd November 1896

Received 26-11-96

Enclosures A to Z 1, A2 to 62, 60

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Lieut Kelly :—

Submitting replies to the allegations made by — about the harsh treatment of the Executive Engineer Bellary Division (Mr. Somers Eve)

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Memo	4150C	P.W.	16-11-96 ✓
"	3628C	"	21-10-96 ✓
"	3435C	"	24-9-96 ✓
"	3436C	"	24-9-96 ✓
"	4407C	"	25-11-96 ✓
"	4246C	"	19-11-96 ✓
"	4063C	"	12-11-96 ✓
"	3787C	"	29-10-96 ✓
"	1451D	"	1-10-96 ✓
"	1219D	"	4-9-96 ✓
"	1127D	"	21-8-96 ✓
"	992D	"	6-8-96 ✓
"	834D	"	21-7-96 ✓
"	2787C	"	10-7-96 ✓
"	2514C	"	12-6-96 ✓
"	1295C	"	7-3-96 ✓
"	1104C	"	26-2-96 ✓
"	4129C	"	21-12-95 ✓
"	3850C	"	5-12-95 ✓
"	3623C	"	22-11-95 ✓
"	3373C	"	8-11-95 ✓
"	742D	"	14-8-95 ✓
G.O.	1857W	-	26-7-95 ✓
Memo	616D	"	24-7-95 ✓
"	2682C	P.W.	5-9-95 ✓
"	1504C	"	8-4-95 ✓
"	1073C	"	14-3-95 ✓
"	853C	"	6-3-95 ✓
"	3848C	"	1-12-94 ✓
G.O.	1550W	-	23-6-94 ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No. 2663W

Supty: Engineer's Office, III Circle,
23rd November 1896.

From

W. B. de Wenton Esqr.
Supty: Engineer, III Circle,
Bellary.

To

The Chief Engineer,
P.W. Department,
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement No. 3435C dated 24th September 1896, I have the honour to forward herewith a detailed reply by Mr. Somers Eve, Executive Engineer, Bellary Division to the allegations made by Lieutenant Kelly in his petition addressed to His Excellency the Governor, and that Officer's report as to why the petition to Colonel Pennycuick dated 21st December 1895 was not forwarded.

2. Mr. Somers Eve has already explained in his No. 6189 dated 2nd November 96 forwarded with this Office endorsement No. 2406 dated 3rd November 96, why there has been so much delay in submitting this reply.

3. As I know nothing personally of Lieutenant Kelly, or of his relations with Mr. Somers Eve, he having left

Section Report for Septr

1/554B
1/1115

List of documents forwarded with Exec: Engineers Office — No. 1299 dated 9th November 1896.

List of Papers.

Description of marks.

Memo by Mr J. J. Somers.
Eve on Lieut. Kelly's petition to H. E. the Governor ____ A

Memo by Mr J. J. Somers.
Eve on Lieut. Kelly's petition to Colonel Pennycuick R.E. ____ B

Memo by Mr J. J. Somers.
Eve on Lieut. Kelly's petition to Colonel D. Mc Campbell R.E. ____ C

List of Enclosures.

Copy of letter from the Exec: Engineer to Supt'g Engr. No. 3446 dated 30th July 1895. ____ D

Letters from Lieut. Kelly to the Supt'g Engr. No. A/7 dated 13-12-95 & Sub Dl. Officer Cinnamon Peak No. B/7 dated 13-12-95 with Copy of Inspection Report for Septr ____ E

was

Memo marked F. F

Lieut. Kelly's Ten day Pro: Report
from 19th March to 22nd April 95. G

Copy of Exec: Engr's letter to the
Dist Surgeon Bellary No. 2181/13.5.95 H

Copy of Dist. Surgeon letter to the
Exec: Engineer Bellary No. 1544/13.5.95 I

Copy of Exec: Engr's letter to Lieut.
Kelly No. 1792 dated 20th April 95 J

Letter from Lieut. Kelly to Exec:
Engineer No. 9 of 7th May 95 K

Copy of Chief Engineer's Memo
No. 1073C dated 14th March 95 L

Copy of Lieut. Kelly's letter No. 18
dated 14th May 1895 to Exec: Engineer M

do No. 17 dated 14.5.95 do. N

do No. 20 dated 15.5.95 do O

Copy of letter from Exec: Engineer
to Suptg Engineer No. 2344 of 23.5.95 P

Copy of Lieut. Kelly's letter No.
239 dated 5.8.95 with Exec: Engr's
and Suptg Engr's Endt. thereon Q

Copy of Suptg Engineer No.
1412 & 1413/10.8.95 to Exec: Engineer R

Copy of Ex: Engr. to Suptg Engr.
No. 3825 of 20.8.95 S

Copy of Memo from Suptg Engr.
to Ex Engr. No. 1591 of 22.8.95. T

Copy of Memo from Suptg Engr.
to Ex: Engineer No. 1857 of 9.9.95 U

Copy of letter from Exe Engineer
to Lieut. Kelly No. 4183 of 4.9.95. V

Extract from Ten day Pro: Report
of Lieut. Kelly from 21 to 31 Oct 95. W

Lieut. Kelly's letter to Subdiv. Offr.
Anantapur No. 418 of 9.11.95 with
3 enclosures. X

Copy of Medical Certificate
granted to Mrs. Kelly Y

Copy of Ex: Engr's letter to the
Suptg Engineer No. 5432/4.11.95 Z

Copy of Suptg Engr's Memo to the
Exec Engineer No. 2511/8.11.95 Z1

P.T.O

Exec: Engr

Petition from Lieut.t J. Kelly
Asst.t Engineer to His Excellency
the Governor dated 29.8.96 ——— A2
Memorial to Col. J. Pennycuick RE,
dated 21st December 1895 ——— B2
Letter from Lieut.t J. Kelly
Asst.t Engineer to the Supt.g
Engineer dated 12-8-96 ——— C2
Letter from Lieut.t J. Kelly to the
Chief Engineer dd 14.5.96 ——— D2
——— do ——— do ——— 24.7.96 ——— E2
——— do ——— to the Supt.g Engineer
No.s 417 dated 9-11-95 ——— F2
Letter from Lieut.t J. Kelly Asst.t Engr.
to Col. D. Mc.Neil Campbell RE ——— G2

Rev. 10742/96

Enclosure marked A2

Memo on petition
Kelly Assistant En
Excellency the G
Madras.

Letter dated 9th Nov.r is now attached (F2)

The letters to the address of the Superintending Engineer III circle dated 13th, 18th and 22nd November 1895 alluded to in this memorial have not been received in this office.

(a). Memorial to Col: J. Pennycuick R.E marked ~~A~~ B2. Please see clause (b).

← letters refer to paras in petition.

Plain in margin a copy of no: the letter was sent with this office endorsement No 1605 dated 26.8.96. which has partly reflected in Sec: Emps No 6991 of 24.Oct.96. Copy of the above endorsed is attached to the covering letter

Letter to the Superintending Engineer III circle dated 12th August 96 marked C2 has not been received in this office.

Letter to the Chief Engineer dated 14th May 1896 marked C about leave allowance was sent on to the Superintending Engineer III circle with this office endorsement No 2792 dated 21st May 96. This was answered in

in Chief Engineer's No 2787/C dated 9th July 1896 (Superintending Engineer Circle No 1122 dated 15th July) to the effect that the Examiner had correctly computed his leave allowance. This Chief Engineer's memo was forwarded in original to Lieutt J. Kelly with this office No 3909 dated 20th July 1896. After this Lieutt Kelly has written direct to the Chief Engineer in the matter. Vide his letter marked $\frac{C}{V}$. E_2

(b). His letter dated 9th November 95 to the address of the Superintending Engineer III Circle and letter dated 21st 21st December 1895 to Col: J. Pennycuick R.E were not forwarded as my remarks thereon would have been so unfavourable to him and his character that I wished to let the matter drop. This procedure was irregular and

Enclosure marked F2

Enclosure marked B2

I now much regret it. It was however done, entirely out of kindliness to Mr. Kelly. He was a man who had, evidently done good work in his earlier service, had a large family to support. He was on long leave, and had conveyed to me the impression that he was going to retire subsequently. If I had wished to injure him, as he seems to think I did, I had only to report that the District Surgeon, Surgeon Major Evans, considered that the illness which caused him to leave his work on the Soogoor Project was from drink to damage him irretrievably. I wished to avoid this, and that is my reason for this action.

(c). Lieutt Kelly joined this Division, on the 26th March 1895. In June Recommendation Roll he was not reported on by me. His name was omitted probably because my office thought that

that he belonged to the Engineering Establishment and required a separate report under G.O No. 1550 W dated 23rd June 94.

In July, in reply to a request from the Superintending Engineer III Circle I wrote my No 3446 of 30.7.95. Copy herewith marked D.

It will be remembered that Mr Kelly had applied for leave, and had told me he intended to retire, and on these conditions I had promised him that I would not make a special and bad report on his first months work on the Soogoor Project.

Further in this office letter No 3490 dated 2.8.95 I wrote requesting that I might be permitted to defer an expression of opinion as to his capabilities for holding Charge of a Sub-Division in reply to the Superintending Engineer's No 3182 dated 21st March 1895.

The Supdg Engr put 'R' against Lt Kelly name in the Recommendation Roll for half year ending June 30 th/95 Enclosure marked D.

Lt. Kelly sent the Supdg Engr a copy of his letter to his Controlling Officer, reporting that his leave ought to be cancelled, which he considered that he was entitled to do under Code Vol I. Chap VI para 69. The Supdg Engr. took action on this copy before hearing from or referring to the Superintending Engr in the matter.

This view is, though correct. Chief Engr. Memo. No 2602 C dated 5 Sept. 95. amending Memo. No 853 C dated 6 March 95 has overlooked by me. The unfavourable report on Lt Kelly should have been communicated to him by this office & not by the Executive Engr.

W.B. Chisholm
13.11.95

In the Rolls for the Half yearly ending 31st December 95 and 30th June 96 I now recommended him, as in the meantime Mr Kelly had withdrawn his leave in direct communication with the Superintending Engineer III Circle without consulting me, and thus nullified the arrangement by which I had agreed not to report badly on him.

(d). No special report as per Code para 55, Chapter IV. Vol: I quoted which deals with suspension, resignation, and dismissal was made and therefore no Copy was sent. He was not furnished with Copies of my remarks in the Half Yearly Recommendation Rolls for December 95 and for June 1896, as this office was not aware whether they were approved of by the Superintending Engineer. Vide Chief Engineer's Memo

tha Memo No. 2682/C dated 5th Septr 95,
ing which lays down distinctly that
a such adverse reports are only to
155 be sent after approval by the
In Superintending Engineer. Such
th approval was not Communicated
9 to me.
l (g). No defaulter book was
9 received from the Trichinopolly
dr Division where he last served
ar nor was one opened in this
to office.
9 Mr Kelly broke the rules by
w Communicating direct with the
b Superintending Engineer as regards
p the Cancelling of his first leave,
and also by Communicating
3 direct with the Chief Engineer
on the subject of his second
leave.
(f to h). This fine, although,
I consider quite justified, and
Customary was subsequently
remitted, as the Code rules
did not seem to uphold
such

This letter was not forwarded to this office. Enclosure marked E

× unless the retrenchment is ordered sometime 6 months after date of payment, which was not the case in Enclosure marked F this instance

procedure. The proper course would have been to recommend him for a fine not to have stopped it from his Travelling Allowance for that specific reason. Please see also note on letter to Superintending Engineer III Circle marked E

(K). Leave allowance was claimed and passed by the Examiner. The nature of his leave was subsequently altered and the Examiner in the Disallowance list on salary bill for February 1896 disallowed Rs 427.9.11. This was recovered under Code para 65 & 66. Chapter II Vol: II, which allows no option in this respect. A Memo marked (E) is attached which shows that the procedure as regards Mr Kelly's pay was perfectly regular and that there was no delay whatever in this office.

(1). The ruling quoted has no bearing on the subject of over-payment of salaries but refers to retrenchments of irregular, expenditure or loss of, Cash &c. Mr Kelly is very apt to quote Code rules, but he does not appear to grasp their meaning or intention.

(2). Please see above. The rules (Vide paras 65 & 66, Chapter II. Vol II) are distinct and left no option to this office.

A resume of my relations with Mr Kelly is attached in the replies to other petitions. Mr Mildred, Executive Engineer was his Sub. Divisional officer. described him as almost the worst subordinate he ever had under him as regards work.

This seems correct.

L. F. Somerville

13.11.96 F.S

Executive Engineer

P.W. Enc 2 10742/96

Marked B2.

Memo on Memorial to Colonel J. Pennycuick R.E. dated 21st December 1895.

In the promotion Recommendation Rule of VI. Cycle for half Year ending 31 Dec 95 Mr Kelly is not recommended. "The following Report is attached "Not recommended, vide this Office No 1601 T.C dated 31 Jan. 96 & 763 T.C of 6th Aug. 96. Another instance has lately come to notice showing Mr Kelly's ignorance of irrigation work. He is said to know more about building - some of this kind of work which I have seen is creditable" -

L Buchanan

13.11.96 F.S

I request that real reason for his transfer from Trichinopoly Division may be ascertained if necessary from the Chief Engineers office. Mr W. Hughes Supdg Engineer only states that the transfer was probably ordered owing to a junior being placed in charge of Trichinopoly Divn.

2. Calls for no remarks.

3. My Head Clerk told Lieut Kelly to apply to Mr Lawrence late Supervisor Bellary Division for any information he might require in connection with the Sugur Project. My draftsman states that both he and Mr Lawrence shewed him the place & route in the Dist-

District Map. The latter (Mr. Lawrence) also recommended him two lascars to accompany him, who knew the way. Mr. Kelly's statement is absurd. There is a big map in my office & both Mr. Lawrence & my draftsman knew the site of the Project. The latter pointed it out to me when I first joined. I consider Mr. Kelly's action childish & doubt the truth of his statements. Lieut. Kelly arrived here on the 26th March 1895. Orders were written by me on the 23rd & left in the office Yet he puts in his Progress Report that he was awaiting orders on 27th to 29th. On the 30th he went to office and received his orders. The next day was Sunday. He was three days 1st, 2nd & 3rd April going to the wrong place, from 4th to 10th he took levels which were absolutely useless. He returned to Bellary where he had no work on the 11th & stopped there until 17th. He arrived at Sugur on the 20th. 21st was a Sunday. He began levelling from the Amient on the 22nd. He thus joined on 26th March & the first bit of useful work he did was on the 22nd April 1895. His Progress Reports for these periods are enclosed. The Reports from 23rd to 30th April are missing.

Enclosure marked **G**

On May 4th he reports as under Medical treatment. On the 5th he leaves for Bellary. Here he goes under the District Surgeon who tells me privately

Enclosure marked **H**

in reply to my letter No. 2181 of 13th May 1895 asking if it was

Lieut. Kelly's reply thereto No.

was really necessary for Lieut^t^
Kelly to come to Bellary, that he
was suffering from excess of
alcohal. Surgeon Major Evans
asked me if I wished to press
for a reply and I replied that
he need not report this so he
sent letter N^o^ 1544 dated 13 May
1895 marked (I). I have
recently seen Surgeon Major
Evans who says he remembers
these facts perfectly well. Lieut^t^
Kelly was ordered to send in
progress reports every 3 days but
from 21^st^ May he discontinued
it; I left on 5 weeks leave on
the 27^th^ May & he did not return
to Sugur until June 2^d^ during
which time he was doing more
or less useless work of copying
plans which I told him was
not necessary. He was told on
the 20^th^ April that his Head Quarters

Enclosure marked I

Quarters were Sirnuppah but
he remains in Bellary from
6^th^ May. I saw him on the 7^th^
May. On 15^th^ June he finished
the 18^th^ miles of levelling he was
asked to do; thus he was en-
gaged on this from 26^th^ March
to 15^th^ June 1895. Part of the
work was checked by Conductor
Ulyett recently, who states
that Lieut^t^ Kelly's Bench marks
are incorrect and that those
by the previous Surveyor are
Correct. Lieut^t^ Kelly arrived at
Bellary on the 18^th^ June.
I think I am justified in
saying either his capabilities
are poor or not utilized.
The cost of this 18 miles of
levelling to Government is
abnormal.

Enclosure marked J

4 & 5. A Copy of this office
N^o^ 1792 dated 20^th^ April 95 and
Lieut^t^ Kelly's reply thereto N^o^

was re
Kelly
was su
alcoh
asked
for a
he ne
sent
1895
prece
Eva
Kelli
prog

of 7th May 95 enclosure (marked K) in original are put up. I should note that para 3 of Lieut. Kelly's reply is apparently untrue & that the work he did was simply childish, as from the file he knew that a portion of the map was missing.

Enclosure marked K.

6. A Copy of Chief Engineer's Memo No. 1073 C dated 14th March 95 informing the Supdg Engineer that these he is not expected to post Lieut. Kelly in charge of a Sub-Division unless he thinks fit is herewith for enclosure marked L

Enclosure marked L.

it; This Mr Kelly saw in my office.

the 2 A man of his seniority & service
to Who was not supposed to be fit
whi for a Sub Divl Charge could
or le carcely be considered to have
pla satisfactory character. Subse-
not quently the bad report made by
the Lt Hughes as Supdg Engineer VI
circle
ap

Enclosure marked L

circle was forwarded to him on the 3rd August 1895. This Mr Kelly ignores in his remarks.

7. My information as to Mr Kelly's previous work was chiefly gathered from Colonel Drake Brockman, Mr Burlton, & Inspector, all of whom spoke badly of him. The letter posting him to this division was certainly not in his favour enclosure marked (L) Surgeon Major Evans statement as regarding his habits was not to his credit.

Lieut. Kelly asked for previous reports. The only written one Mr Kelly had already seen. Surgeon Major Evans statement was subsequent. This I did not want to make public & to close the correspondence answered shortly. Lieut. Kelly must have seen Chief Engineer's No. 1073 C dated 14th March 95 referred to in re-

putation

the Doogoor Proj

we in para 6 as on it was written
& my order to go to Sugur which
wo was shown to him in my office.
a 8. Remarks unnecessary except
as to call attention to the language
fo & expressions used, which I con-
he sider insubordinate. I question
s whether I am not entitled to
R disregard petitions couched in
p such a way.
E 9. Lieut. Kelly applied for leave,
h early in May, & I expected im-
R mediate sanction & so took
p no steps to alter Head Quarters,
f nor do I consider Kamplis
i would have been suitable, being
th 10 miles from his work. He had
to tents, & Singuppah is not at all
w a bad camping place & there is
or ample water & some shade, but
p there was no necessity for him
not go there except for post and
the supplies.
I myself as an Assistant Engineer

Engineer on a project have had
to camp in tents throughout the
hot weather, in a less favorable
locality & I do not see why Mr.
Kelly could not.
10. Mr. Kelly had not completed
his work by any means.
11. Mr. Kelly has twisted and
contorted facts in a disgrace-
ful manner, & this I must add
is apparent in many parts of
his petition.
Mr. Kelly had not done any thing
like a proper amount of work,
& in my opinion was trying to
"shirk". I therefore considered it
my duty to give him a serious
talking to, & this I did in a firm
but kindly manner, & Mr. Kelly
at the time objected to nothing
I said.
I told him distinctly that I
intended to get work out of my
subordinates, & that I had a re-
putation
the Googoor Division
work.

reputation for so doing. Further that I had been the means of getting rid of one or two men who would not work, & that I should not have the least hesitation in trying to do the same again. I told him that Mr Burlton Deputy Chief Engineer has said that he hoped that I should be able to get some work out of him. He said that he was aware that he was not in Mr Burlton's good books & I replied that Colonel Pennycuick looked to promotions etc himself. I told him that I should have to make a special report on his work up to date, & suggested that the was perhaps past his work, & asked him when he intended to retire & whether he had furlough due. He said he would like to take furlough & retire, but had a large family & insufficient means. I said I was sorry for

for him, but that work must be done, but that if he took furlough, I would not report unfavourably of him. I certainly did wish him to take it, as I thought I should get no useful work out of him, & wanted a man in his place.

Mr Kelly's statements about "instructions" are as absolutely false as they are absurd. As there were no witnesses he apparently thinks he is safe in making them.

12. A copy of Lieut. Kelly's letter No 18 dated 14th May 1895 in which he asks me to forward his application for furlough with my favourable consideration is enclosed. Enclosure marked M

Enclosure marked M

13. Copies of the following correspondence are enclosed

(1) Exec: Engineer's letter to the D

District Surgeon Nº 2181 dated
13th May 1895

Enclosure marked H

(2) Lieutt Kelly's letter to the Exec: Engineer Nº 17 dated 14th May 95. Enclosure marked N

(3) do Nº 20 dated 15th May 95 Enclosure marked O

(4) Letter from District Surgeon to the Exec: Engineer Nº 1544 dated 13th May 95

Enclosure marked I

(5) Letter from Exec: Engineer to Suptg Engineer Nº 2344 dated 23d May 1895.

Enclosure marked P

On my letter Nº 2181 dated 13th May 1895 Surgeon Major Evans asked me privately whether I wished to press for an answer, as the reason Lieutt Kelly was sick was from excessive drink.

14. Lieutt Kelly stopped in Bellary from 7th to 28th May 1895 vide para 3.

15. Copies of the following are enclosed.

Enclosure marked Q

(a) Lieutt Kelly's letter Nº 239 dated 5th July 95 to the Sub Divl officer.

(b) Exec: Engineer's Endorsement on the above Nº 3735 of 10th August 95.

(c) Suptg Engineer's Endt on the above Nº 1543 of 20th August 95.

Enclosure marked R

(d) Suptg Engineer's Nº 1413 of 10-8-95 to the Exec: Engineer.

Enclosure marked S

(e) Letter from Exec: Engineer to the Suptg Engineer Nº 3825 of 20-8-95

Enclosure marked T

(f) Memo from Suptg Engineer to the Exec: Engineer Nº 1591 of 22-8-95

Enclosure marked U

(g) Memo from Suptg Engineer to the Exec: Engineer Nº 1850 of 9-9-95.

16. Lieutt Kelly deceived me and broke rules by writing the Suptg Engineer direct to cancel leave, and it was for this I reprimanded him. On finding he did this by the Suptg Engineer's orders the reprimand was withdrawn vide Copy of this office Nº 4182 of 4-9-95 enclosed.

Enclosure marked V

Mr Kelly pretends to forget that

Dis that he evaded a bad report on his work by applying for leave,

(2) & then cancelled it after obtaining a qualified report from me, he

(3) cancels his leave. It is not clear

(4) why the Supty Engineer recommended him on this letter vide my No. 3446 dated 30-7-95. Enclosure marked **D**

(5) 17. No application was made to this office for chairs &c but they are not a necessity for a camp clerk. Mine in the Godaveri & in the Rushikuliya Project never had one. I presume there were none available & such things take time to make & get sanctions. It is absurd to think Mr. Mildred would have drawn cheque on another Treasury on purpose to annoy. The correspondence was not sent to this office. With regard to the tank, a copy of his Progress & Report is herewith Enclosure marked **W**

18. I ordered Lieut. Kelly not to make remarks as to his opinion of previous officer's work, but to report facts. The Estimate does not specify 1st class rubble and as a matter of fact permission was obtained from the Supty Engineer to substitute brick for most of the work which must have been forwarded to Lieut. Kelly's office. I found Lieut. Kelly giving unnecessary orders to Contractors & considered he was doing mischief & therefore did not allow him to dismantle without sanction from the Sub Divl. Officer.

19. Lieut. Kelly was not ordered not to report on bad work, he was told not to dismantle without Sub Divl. officer's approval. The latter part of the para is absurd. Slow contractors can be pushed

pushed & quickened by good subordinates.

20. Lieutt Kelly's rambling letter is attached. There is a great difference between passively obstructing works & actively pushing them: I consider he took the former course. One Contractor told me as an excuse for slow progress that Lieutt Kelly would not let him commence any new piece of work until he came to the work, & when he did, he did not set out or give orders for such work. Enclosure marked X

21 & 22. These remarks refer to Jadputri Jalug Cutcherry, Gooty Jalug Cutcherry had been terraced in the way Mr Mildred desired and this building was also in charge of Lieutt Kelly. It was understood that the Jadputri was to be done in the same way. From records I

I gather that Mr Mildred said the work was bad because the bricks were not soaked before use & this while Lieutt Kelly was on the work for two days, & not because a particular specification had been followed.

23. Mr Mildred states that he gave no such order whatever, & that his remark on Sen day report was to the effect that measurements should be taken by the 20th, not from the 20th & bills submitted by the 25th. Lieutt Kelly knows perfectly well that it is absolutely necessary to submit monthly bills & in time for check in the Subdivision office. There were numerous letters addressed from this office to emphasize the importance of this, as ordered by the Chief Engineer. It should have been quite unnecessary for Lieutt Kelly to have needed a special order on the

the Doogoor

pushed & quickened by good subordinates.

Dis

20. Lieut. Kelly's rambling letter is attached. There is a great difference between passively obstructing works & actively pushing them: I consider he took the former course. One Contractor told me as an excuse for slow progress that Lieut. Kelly would not let him commence any new piece of work until he came to the work, & when he did, he did not set out or give orders for such work.

(2) (3) (4)

Enclosure marked X

21 & 22. These remarks refer to Jadputri Jalug Cutcherry, Gooty Jalug Cutcherry had been terraced in the way Mr Mildred desired and this building was also in charge of Lieut. Kelly. It was understood that the Jadputri was to be done in the same way. From records I

Mr

I gather that Mr Mildred said the work was bad because the bricks were not soaked before use, & this while Lieut. Kelly was on the work for two days, & not because a particular specification had been followed.

23. Mr Mildred states that he gave no such order whatever, & that his remark on Sen day report was to the effect that measurements should be taken by the 20th, not from the 20th & bills submitted by the 25th. Lieut. Kelly knows perfectly well that it is absolutely necessary to submit monthly bills & in time for check in the Subdivision office. There were numerous letters addressed from this office to emphasize the importance of this, as ordered by the Chief Engineer. It should have been quite unnecessary for Lieut. Kelly to have needed a special order on the

the Soogoor

pushed & quickened by good subordinates.

20. Lieut. Kelly's rambling letter is attached. There is a great difference between passively obstructing works & actively pushing them: I consider he took the former course. One Contractor told me as an excuse for slow progress that Lieut. Kelly would not let him commence any new piece of work until he came to the work, & when he did, he did not set out or give orders for such work.

Enclosure marked X

21 & 22. These remarks refer to Jadputri Jalug Cutcherry, Gooty Jalug Cutcherry had been terraced in the way Mr. Kildred desired and this building was also in charge of Lieut. Kelly. It was understood that the Jadputri was to be done in the same way. From records I

I gather that Mr. Kildred said the work was bad because the bricks were not soaked before use & this while Lieut. Kelly was on the work for two days, & not because a particular specification had been followed.

23. Mr. Kildred states that he gave no such order whatever, & that his remark on Sen day report was to the effect that measurements should be taken by the 20th, not from the 20th & bills submitted by the 25th. Lieut. Kelly knows perfectly well that it is absolutely necessary to submit monthly bills & in time for check in the Subdivision office. There were numerous letters addressed from this office to emphasize the importance of this, as ordered by the Chief Engineer. It should have been quite unnecessary for Lieut. Kelly to have needed a special order on the

p. subject. This was not the only oc-
s- casion of late submission. Fur-
20- ther the Sub Divisional officer com-
is- plained that Lieut. Kelly's bills
de were invariably sent up incorrectly
ob and threw a lot of extra work in
- in his office.
for 24. Lieut. Kelly certainly tra-
tol- velled considerably, but I formed
pro the opinion, rightly or wrongly, that
not he did it with the view of making
rea money from Travelling Allowance
to the and I do not think in many cases
did so much travelling was useful.
for He kept no horse I know, nor Camp
21 st. equipage I believe. He was as an
to Ja Assistant Engineer entitled to
Goo double 1st class fare, & this he in-
terra variably claimed, but I understand
desi he travelled 2d class. I saw him
also doing so on one occasion.
It 25. There is no record in my
Jad/ office about the casual leave, but

but I most certainly should
have granted it. The Sub Divl Officer
did require the information ur-
gently about rates, & had been
asking for them for some time
he informed me. Lieut. Kelly
could have given it in a few
hours. The information was not
available in the Sub Divl office.
26. Lieut. Kelly's statement is
curiously mixed. The medical
certificate applies to his wife
& the leave to him. A copy of
Enclosure marked Y the certificate is attached.
From this there is no very great
urgency apparent. As regards
the leave his application was
forwarded to the Suply Engineer
with my letter No. 5432 dated 4.11.95
Enclosure marked Z Copy attached & was replied to
by Colonel Campbell (copy attached)
Enclosure marked Z1 vide letter No. 2511 of 8.11.95. It
will be remembered that Lieut.
Kelly had previously applied

applied for leave & then had it cancelled in an unsatisfactory manner. The remarks in this para appear to me to be quite uncalled for.

27. Lieut. Kelly's statement is incorrect. Two subordinates were short in the Division. I must call attention to the incorrect and insubordinate language used in this para. The sanctioned strength of this Division is 13. Including Lieut. Kelly there were only 11 as may be seen from the Salary bills for October and November 1895. Of these, one Sergeant Anderton was on Privilege leave at the time of Lieut. Kelly's application.

28. I believe a reference to the recommendation rolls in the Chief Engineer's office will disprove this. I must again draw attention to the language used.

I must express my regret that

that this petition was not forwarded, but I trust that it will be found that my charges against Mr. Kelly are sufficient to justify me in thinking that it would be kindness to him not to make them. As Mr. Kelly was on long leave I was personally quite indifferent as to his opinion.

W. F. Somerville

Exec. Engineer

the Doogoor Project this wi

Marked G2

Notes on letter from Lieutt J. Kelly
Assistant Engineer to Col: D McNeil
Campbell RE Chief Engineer

In reply to this I have to state with reference to para 1, that my reasons for not forwarding his first petition have been given, that there is no code rule stating that non-recommendations should be sent to a subordinate, and that Chief Engineer's Circular No 2682 C of 5.9.95 states that such remarks should only be sent after being approved by the Superintending Engineer. Such approval was not communicated to me.

I consider Mr Kelly's work in this Division was extremely unsatisfactory. On his arrival I gave him work which would plainly show whether he was able a [illegible] work. On the Soogoor Khal [illegible] as [illegible] answer with [illegible]

W. Enc 3
10742/96

was childish for the first half of the time, and in second half a little better. The out turn of useful work was what a surveyor on Rs 60 should have been ashamed of. He admits that his levels are not reliable, and on some of them being checked by Mr Wyatt, he reports them wrong. The strength of subordinates having fallen short, the Superintending Engineer ordered the Project investigation to be held in abeyance, and from that time it is more difficult to prove he was "unsatisfactory", but I saw and heard quite enough of him to justify the opinion I formed of him. Mr Kelly writes in a very plausible way, as if to show excessive zeal, but works fell off under him, and on one minor irrigation work he was told to investigate, the report was useless, and

W. Sec 10742/46

the necessary levels omitted. Mr Mildred Executive Engineer was his Sub. Divisional Officer, who rather erred in his kindly treatment to men who did not work. He states he could not get satisfactory work, either as regards progress or punctuality from Mr. Kelly

I have nothing to say against Mr Kelly's moral character. The District Surgeon stated that he was ill from excess of alcohol, and on two occasions I saw him, I rather thought the same.

With regard to para 2, I only hold the non-recommendation of Mr Hughes the Superintending Engineer VI Circle of 31.12.1894.

Para 3 (a) Mr Kelly was directed not to order work to be pulled down without the approval of his Sub. Divisional officer. He was never forbidden "to make any remarks what...

about work or to give orders
without Sub. Divisional offiers
afroval". This is a mis-state-
ment and twisting of orders
given which were as under.
Gooty Cutchery was 3 parts
finished when he took charge.
He measured some of the rooms,
and found them wrong (he
does not say how much) and
then gave his opinion that
"it showed great carelessness
on the Overseer's part". The
work happened to have been
set out by an Executive
Engineer and an Assistant
Engineer, and I therefore told
him "to report facts" and
that it was not his place
to censure previous offiers.
On another occasion the
Contractor and maistry of
of the School house Ananta-
pur asked me to inspect some
Concrete aggregate on account

of which he had stopped work
going on. I did so and found
it was quite good enough for
the purpose intended. There
was another Case at the
Police office, the details of
which I do not quite recollect,
but I came to the conclusion
that it would be better not
to allow him to dismantle
work without afroval and
directed accordingly. The
Contractor's work, as a rule
in his charge was exceptional
good, and I did not want
them unjustly harassed.

Further remarks are con-
tained in the margin of
Mr Kelly's petition

J. F. Somerset
3.10.96

Executive Engr

Copy of letter from J. T. Somerville Lieut Executive Regiment Bellary division to the Deputy: Regiment III circle Bellary No 34446 dated 30: July 1895.

With reference to your No 12470/ 23.7.95 I have the honor to state that Lieut Kelly for the first half of the time he was with me did exceedingly indifferent work— Since then however he has improved and has some good points to show on paper. I have not inspected it on the field as yet. I neither recommend nor non-recommend him on this occasion.

Comy.
J. T. Somerville.
Lieut: Regt

4
12/96
W. 10747 re June on account

No A/7

Bangalore
13th Dec/95.

From
Lieut J Kelly
Asst. Engr. A.W.D

To
The Supg Engineer
III Circle
Thro The S.D.O
Anantapore

Sir,

The Sub: Divisional Office in his No: 957/28.11.95 informs me that my Office an explanation in consequence of bills for the following works not having been submitted before the 25 Sept 1895.

1. G.O.C. Sub Registrar Office
2. Tadpatri. Taluq Cutcherry
3. Appalacherla - Tank Supply Channel

2 In response to the above, I beg to State as follows:-

The S.D.O in his No: 2757 ordered that measurements of work should be commenced on the 20th and all bills submitted by the 25 of each month and thus pointed out to be impracticable for the following reasons:-

My head Quarters for the months of September was Penna Konda 40 miles from Anantapore 88 miles from Gooty, 98 from Appalacherla and 110 from Tadpatri but in compliance with the Orders of the S.D.O. I commenced to keep measurements

No 821
11-1-96. Forwarded thro the Executive Engineer Bellary
Chittoor
S.D.O.
11.1.96

There is no such order. This No. relates to a different subject

Engineer's report was by the 20th not known relating to measurements of works

By rail. Chittoor

Written Contract Office
Measurement Book
Page
Abstract
Office
Sub Division
Chittoor
Date
Sub Division
Chittoor
Date

wag 2

5
on 4/2/96

measurements on the dates specified below:-

19th Septr/95. Police Office Armankopne – Measured work.

20th –do– High School –do– –do– went to Pimmakonda at 11 o'Clock

21st –do– Sub Collectrs Do –do– Took measurement at Pimmakonda for estimate

to prepare estimate –

22nd –do– Sunday –

23rd –do– Marched to Gajalodinne to lay out profiles for Contractor.

24th –do– Pegged out work for Contractor & furnished him with a Sketch & written instructions &c. – Proceeded 30 miles by train to Guntakal. –

25th –do– Resumed work at Telegraph Office Guntakal & Continued journey to Gooty.

26th –do– Resumed work at Gooty Cutcherry

27th –do– Proceeded to Appalacherla – 8 miles from Gooty – Resumed work there & proceeded to Tadpatri 30 miles from Gooty.

28th –do– Resumed work at Gooty.

29th –do– Sunday.

30th –do– Office.

3. You will see from the above and from my inspection report that although I commenced inspecting on the 19th instead of on the 20th and performed as much as possible

+ Copy enclosed

Please see remark above. Engr.

The clerk was left at Gooty from 21st to 30 which must have caused delay also.

journey by rail it was impossible to get round and complete the measurements in the three talugs before the 28th – After inspecting it was necessary to prepare three copies of measurement sheets, giving full details of each item of work and also three copies of bills the preparation of which involved much time and fully occupied the time of the clerk who had further to work at nights to complete them – All this was unavoidable & the time spent in travelling and I may mention that notwithstanding all bills were submitted before the end of the Month and I believe paid a fact which can be ascertained by reference to the expenditure on the above works for September. –

why three

No. 2 bills were not paid as there was not time to check them

Hammerton Bills for Paigahm – Also Cutcherry were not paid for want of Sanction

4. From the facts above enumerated it will be apparent that there was no undue delay either on my part or on that of any clerk in the Sub: Division of the bills and it is certainly a poor recompense to me after a Conscientious discharge of my duties to find myself recommended for a fine of Rs: 66 –

5. In this connection I request your attention

attention to para 886 A R I Vol I Part I, Pay,
from which you will observe that no
punitive deduction can be made
from my pay & allowances except
under the Sentence of a Competent
Court and in Soliciting your
favorable Consideration to the facts
alleged in this Communication I
beg with all deference to State that
in the event of your Supporting
the recommendation that I should
be fined half my travelling allowance
for September I have no other alternative
but to claim a trial by Court
Martial.—

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obed Servant

P.W. Encl 1074²/96
Signature:

X P. Kelly Lieut
Asst Engr P.W.D.

W.D.

Although I consider Mr Kelly
performed travelling needlessly in
connection with the work done, & that
under Code para 100 Vol I. Chap II
he could be stopped on T.A. still
this person must does not come
under code rules, & the
T.A. is ordered to be paid. The
Commissariat & ordnance have
[illegible]
1/96

Mr Kelly could have
attended to this more important
works & need not have gone
to Penukonda until the
end of the month - in which
case he would have had
ample time to [illegible]

Inspection Report of Lt J. Kelly from 1st to 30th September 1895.
Head Quarters Penukondah.

Date	Name of work inspected.	Remarks	Distance from H.Q. Quarters	Distance travelled By Rail	By Road	Remarks by Sub Divisional Officer.
			109			
1st		Sunday				
2nd	Gooty	Office				
3rd	Do Valay cutchery	no work owing to some fest.				
4th	Thadpatri Valay cutchery	work progressing.	143	34.4		
5th	Do Construction Latrine -	checked foundations found marking incorrect had the same rectified Superintended mixing of Concrete, showed mistry how it was to be mixed and saw it put down in foundations	143			
6th	Appalacherla Supply channel	closing breaches and reconstructing revet to correspond with old revet in progress noticed in estimate for Construction body wall to 2nd course: no provision was made for foundations. Sent report with Sketch to S. D. O. for orders.	109	23-8		
7th	Gooty Valay cutchery -	A few masons dressing stone and a few [illegible] breaking stone [illegible] instruction from S. [illegible] regarding what [illegible]	109			

Month & date	name of work inspected	Remarks	Distance from H.Q. Rs	Distance Travelled by Rail Rs	by R.	Remarks by S.D.O.
		on wood is to be placed over beams.				
8th	"	Sunday.				
9th	Gantkul Telegraph office	Iron band along tiles and fixing ceiling planks almost completed	109	36.		
10th	Poota Shatha cherew. Tank repairs	Inspected the whole bund found in good order Repairs completed and paid for Except small portion of revet which was measured but could not check depth as there was no workmen to take up portion ordered Contractor to have a stone or two taken up to Examine thickness.	109	18		
11th		En route to Tadpatri.	143	34-4		
12th	Thadpatri Taluq Cutchery Do Latrine	Work progressing. walls raised one foot above base.	143			
13th	Thadpatri Taluq Cutchery	Raining no work Engaged in preparing revised Estimate.	143			
14th	Do - Do	Do Completed rough Estimate	143			
15th		Sunday.	109	34-4		
16th	Gooty Post office.	Inspected after heavy rain Roof to be repaired	109			

Month & date	name of work inspected.	Remarks.	Distance from H.Q. Rs	Distance Travelled by Rail Rs	by R.	Remarks by S.D.O.
		building is now water tight.	146	60-3		
		En route to Anantapur	46	-10		
17th						
18th	Rapthad Tank Reference -	Inspected tank made. sketch of sluice and sent S.D.O. with report.	66			
19th	Constructing Police officers School Anantapur. Inspectors Quarters repairs to - Constructing High School Anantapur	Tank measurement of work done on both buildings white wash on walls being scraped. Measured work done -				
20th	Police officers Constructing Latrine High School Anantapur	checked foundations ordered maistry not to lay concrete till the corners were perfectly Squared. to chip portion of concrete reported by maistry to be badly done ordered six inches to be taken up and relaid. Ordered maistry to remove all boulders found in the wall just Commenced.		46-2		
		En route to Penakonda.				
21st	Sub Collectors office Penakonda	Preparing Estimate for Stone uprights for wire fence.		-1		
		Sunday				
22nd		En route to Gooty	56	56		
23rd						

Month & Date	Name of work inspected.	Remarks	Distance from Q.T. 2nd	Distance travelled		Remarks by S.D.O.
	Brahmanbaria			By Rail	By Rd	
24	Bamanamunga -kuna. Tank repairs.	Placed pegs at every 100 ft. showing height bank was to be raised, noticed where breach occurred. The bund was over a bed of rock ordered Contractor to dig a trench 3 ft wide to see if it was possible to escape rocks. Gave Contractor written instructions as to the work to be done with sketch.	89	35-8		
	No 2 Otakunta Tank.	Do — Do — Do — It would be advisable to appoint a maistry for these two tanks to see that instructions are carried out				
		En route to Gooty.				
25th	Telegraph Office Gantakul.	Took measurements of work done Telegraph master reports building still leaks. Ordered Contractor to see to this.	109	43-2		
26th	Gooty Taluq Cutcherry	Taking measurements of work done. Tested some stuff brought for asphalt for mixing to be pitch. It would be	109			

Month & Date	Name of work inspected.	Remarks	Distance from H.Q.	Distance travelled By Rail	By Road	Remarks by S.D.O.
		to order asphalt cement & paint from some respectable firm otherwise damaged cement and other inferior stuff will be purchased.				leave where
27th	Attiala chenda Tank channel	measured work done formd work was not built as per instructions though portion done before mine inspection was ordered to be taken up and repacked brought some to notice of S.D.O.	143	30-2		
28th	Thadpatri Cutcherry	measured work done Cook & Calvins walls raised full height	143 100		.4	
29th		Sunday				
30th		office.				

Sign J Kelly
Asst Engs

True copy
J Kelly
Asst Engs
13/12/95

No B
F

Spencer Road
Sunny Side
Bangalore 13th Dec/95

S.W.D. Reg No 2239
16-12-95

From
Lieut. J. Kelly
Asst Engineer

To
The S. D. Officer
Cantonment

Sir Referring to your No 957
28-11-95
I have the honor the enclosed
explanation with a copy of
Inspection notes for Sept/95
and to request the same may be
forwarded to the Supdg Engineer

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obt Servant

J Kelly
Asst Engr
The Executive Engr
Bellary Divn

No 1042 of 16 Decr

Returned to
Lieut Kelly for his
signature to enclosure
the letter should be sent through
Subdivl
Engr.

Note
See my remarks
Engr.
20/12/95

2.

3.

8

Sec 7
10742/96

Memo

Lieut Kelly's objections	Remarks
1. My pay for first 15 days in November was not drawn till after the holidays in January.	Lieut Kelly did not leave his address and his whereabouts was not known. From his letter of 18.12.95 received in this office on 25.12.95 his address was gathered and a requisition was prepared on the 27th Dec 1895 for pay for November 95 (11 days) & Travelling allowance for September & October 1875 & despatched on the 4th January 1876.
2. That from the 16th to 30th Nov and from 1st to 31st Dec was not drawn till February.	2. The leave allowances from 16th to 30th November 1875 was disallowed from the Bill for Nov 1875 by the Examiner pending sanction to leave. This was again included in the bill for December 1875 which was received back audited on 3rd Feby 1876 and a requisition sent on the 4th February 1876.
3. That of January was drawn in March	3. The bill for January 96 was received back audited on 5th March 1876 and a requisition [illegible]

[illegible] 10742/96

4: That no pay was drawn for February March, & April & Rs 131 only were drawn as being balance of pay due from 16.11.95 to 30.4.96 after deducting what was due.

4. She was first granted 6 months leave, and was allowed to draw full pay for the first 60 days, but as the leave was subsequently extended by 6 months this concession was not granted & the difference of back pay was retrenched by the Examiner & until the overpayment was adjusted he was not paid & this is according to Code rule. It will thus be seen that there was no delay in this office, & procedure was according to rules.

JE.

No 1612.
4.4.95.

Lieut Kelly will please submit reports every 3 days of the work he does - The report to be explicit & detailed.

J. F. Somerville
3/4/95
Exec Engr.

9/13/4/95

No 5 copy

(E. No. 139.)

Circle.— III
Division.— Bellary
Year.—1895.

Progress Report of Works

in charge of Lieutt J Kelly
Asstt Engineer
from 19th to 31st March 1895.

13/4/95 No 3

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S REGISTRY No. 1 APR. 20 BELLARY DIVISION

Is Lt Kelly here —
If so send him to me

JE
3.4

for
No. He left for
on leave evening —
last
3/4

Name of Work and Date of Inspection.	Remarks by Subordinate or Sub-Divisional Officer.	Remarks by Executive Engineer.
1	2	3
19th March/95	Handed overcharge.	
20th to 23rd	Making preparations to start.	
24, 25 & 26	En-route to Bellary and arrived at Bellary and reported arrival to Supdg: Engineer as ordered.	
27 to 29th	Awaiting orders	Orders were issued by me on 23rd & left in the Office
30th	Received file of papers from Acctt regarding Sugur Chl. with note to check B. M. and report on ruined Anicut.	
31st	— Sunday —	

J. Kelly
Asst Engineer
1-4-95

Name of Work and Date of Inspection.	Remarks by Subordinate or Sub-Divisional Officer.	Remarks by Executive Engineer.
1	2	3

20,000—1-6-94.

1 to 10 4
95

No 1765
16-4-95.

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER
16 APR
SECRETARY DIVISION

Engrs Report of Wks
in charge of Lieut J Kelly
Asst Engineer
From 1st to 10th April 1895

Lt Kelly
This Report shd have been
submitted on 11th
You are requested to state
fuller details in future -
in fact I want a very
detailed account of
the work you do each
day, with some remarks
on the work - Levels &c.

JE.
14/4

I sent Lt Kelly such
instructions on this
project, which I wish
to press.

JE.
14.4

EC.

GH
17/4/95

R.W. Euro
10742/96

(E. No. 139.)

CIRCLE.— III

DIVISION.— Bellary

YEAR.—1895.

Progress Report of Works

in charge of Lieut J. Kelly Engrs

Assistant Engineer

from 11th *to* 13th April 1895

No 1816
23.4.95.

Name of Work and Date of Inspection.	Remarks by Subordinate or Sub-Divisional Officer.	Remarks by Executive Engineer.
1	2	3
1st April		
H Soogur Channel	Entrance to Bagavada	
2nd do do	do do	
3rd do do	do do	
4 do do	Commenced taking levels from tail end of proposed channel along line marked on Village Map 6300 ft	
5th do do	do do 7020	
6th do do	do do 10881	What done on the 6th
7th	Sunday	
8th do do	completed levels through Bagavada lands. did not finish B. No 4260	
9th do do	Commenced and completed levels through Iborkampura lands and Commenced levels through Suragappala lands finished B. No	Starts length levelled each day plan.
10th do do	Went over a portion of the Suragappala lands. Not knowing a trace of this portion of the line among the papers hence could not proceed	you have all the papers plan are I believe to your must proceed.

J. Kelly
Asst Engrs
14/3/95.

J.E.
2—95.

P.W. Encl 1074 2/96

Some of the papers are missing from the file

5,000—26-2-94.

Name of Work and Date of Inspection.	Remarks by Subordinate or Sub-Divisional Officer	Remarks by Execut[illegible] Engineer.
1	2	3
11th April 1895	Returned to Head Quarters to be Executive Engineer.	
12th do	Good Friday	
13th do	Attended Executive Engineers office, was informed Executive Engineer was out on Circuit, Received Cheque for Salary.	Absent Sam Plener out than in J.K. 19/4/95

J. Kelly
Assistant Engr.

P.S. Ex 12 10742/96

(E. No. 139.)

CIRCLE.—

DIVISION.—

YEAR.—189

Progress Report of Works

in charge of Lieut J. Kelly

Asst Engineer

from 14 to 16 April 1895.

PUBLIC WORKS ENGINEER'S OFFICE 23 APR 95 BELLARY DIVISION

No 1825
23.4.95.

Remarks with the

Name of Work and Date of Inspection.	Remarks by Subordinate or Sub-Divisional Officer	Remarks by Executive Engineer.
1	2	3
14th April Seagun Channel	Sunday	
15th do do	Waiting Ite Bank opens to draw salary Attended E. E office & see if E. E returned	This is perfect book The report called for is to be submitted.
16 do do	do do. Saw S. E to get some information regarding the Seagun Channel	

J. Kelly
Asst Engrs
15/4/95

19.4

Circle III
Division – Bellary.
Year 1895.

Progress Report of Work's
Incharge of – Lieutt J. Kelly
Assistant Engineer S.F.W.
from 14th to 19th April 1895.

No 1938
29.4.95

Recd
Superintendent

13
10742/96

(E. No. 139.)

CIRCLE.—) III
DIVISION.— Bellary
YEAR.—1895.

Progress Report of Works

in charge of Lieutt J. Kelly
Assistant Engr
from 20th to 22 April 1895.

No 1939
29.4.95

Name of Work and Date of Inspection.	Remarks by Subordinate or Sub-Divisional Officer.	Remarks by Executive Engineer.
1	2	3
Soogur Project		
17th April	Attended Bank. Cashed Salary & Impress Cheques, Paid Lascar's Employed and Started for Kamplis. Lascar's did not follow owing to not receiving an advance, am now without a lascar or messenger to look after & pitch tents.	
18th "	Enroute to Kamplis, wrote to officer incharge of Pensioned pay office to send out five pensioned Sepoys for Survey work also asked S. E. who was out in Camp to order his messenger to send out a few men.	
19th	Arrived at Kamplis & made Enquires regarding the Soogur Anicut, as a ruined Anicut is shewn in Sketch given to me near Village called Kamli was informed that Soogur Anicut was Quite washed down - Tried to get Coolies to accompany me but none would leave their village Met Mr Lawrence who promised to send out some men as soon as he gets back to Bellary.	

J. Kelly
Assistant Engineer

Rec'd 24/5/95

Ex 14 10742/96.

5,000—26-2-94.

Name of Work and Date of Inspection.	Remarks by Subordinate or Sub-Divisional Officer	Remarks by Executive Engineer.
1	2	3
20th April 1895. Soojur Project	Enroute to Rudrapatnam Pitched tents and went over a portion of the trace with Plan to Note B.M's.	
21st	Sunday -	
22nd	Took levels from Anicut Compared with with B.M. Noted in Plan found a difference in two B.M's of from 6" to 9" in a distance of 11500 feet. The Crest of the anicut was as per Surveyors levels assumed to be 86.00 above datum, and my levels Reduced on this. The Anicut being of uneven Stones packed Together & no particular Stones marked where the Surveyor placed his Staff it would be hard to Say which of the two levels are correct. The B.M. Stone at 2nd mile has a Slope at top & if Staff was placed at highest Point by Surveyor there would be a difference, as my Staff was	I presume you are leaving proper B.M's now. you will keep a list of course, & make a clear sketch & description of each so that they can be traced.

Name of Work and Date of Inspection.	Remarks by Subordinate or Sub-Divisional Officer.	Remarks by Executive Engineer.
1	2	3
	placed in Centre. C. Kelly Asst Eng 22-4-95	P.A The staff should always be held on the highest point of a B.M on a stone. 24/4. 7 miles 27-4-95 A poor 3 days work
	Note Being 15 miles from a Post office I have not received any papers — since leaving Head Quarters, Having no Peons or Messengers to send to the Post this is handed to the Village Munsiff to send PA	There are such things as coolies in the country. The Asst Eng will be reasonable if he does not arrange for the proper remittal & on basis of his tappal. J.T. Jones Esq 27.4.95

5,000—26-2-94.

Copy of letter from J. T
Executive Surgeon Bellas/ Dep
District Surgeon Bellas/
Dated 13th May 1875.

I have the honor to
that Lieut Kelly came into
stating that he was in
need of medical advice.
request that you will con
this if such is the case,
if necessary grant him
certificate for such
as you may deem

---

copy
J. T. Jones
Surgeon