

Public Works (1897) Department.

Done soon

G.O., No. 3142 *W*

DATED 11 Nov 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

*R. Viswanatha Aiyar, Temp. Supervisor: Sanction
of the prosecution of — certain Criminal
charges and requesting the S.E. to so Rat the
all overnment Pleader at madurai is pro-
perly instructed by his Department.*

Connected paper

516925-129

P.W. 24.
5,000—50-11-06.

Indexed.

15/11

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

The Supt. Engineer, V. Circle
with enclos. held.
Examiner, P.W. Accounts
1155
10/11/97
P.R.

18/5/97
C. 18/5/97.

Telephone

From H.C., P.W. Secretariat

To

The Manager

Private Secy's Office

With —

~~with~~ the papers about
the proposed prosecution
of Temporary Supervisor
C.R. Viswanatha were
9 Measurements books.

The whole file was
sent to His Excellency
at Ootacamund on
18.5.97, but the
papers came back
on the 6th instant
without the measure-
ment books. These are
very important docu-
ments & are now
required for transmission
to

DW

When these papers
were circulated to H.E.
on the 18th May last
there were 9 measure-
ment books sent with
them. These are most
important documents
connected with the case.
The papers have come
back from Govt. Home
without the measure-
ment ^{books}. The G.O. is
~~ready for despatch~~.

I have tele-
phoned to the Manager
of the Private Secy's
office about them. Meanwhile
orders are requested
whether the order may
be despatched without
the

the measurements
books which will be
sent on on receipt. The
g.v. is ready for issue.

Rur

11/11

Perhaps it would be
better to make sure that
the books are been taken for
the care will be weakened

C.M.S.

with a "11-57"
them.

Despatch

award reply

from the Manager of the
Private Secretary's Office

Rur

11/11/87

Books
received
12/11/87

The Supt. Eng. in
connection with the
prosecution of the
Supervisor. Please
therefore send them
by a special messenger.

Rur

11/11/87

despatch
11/11/87

RR

Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 10679

Order

From

The Superintending Engineer
W. Birch

No. 1462 Ind.

Dated 20 November 1896.

Received 24. 11. 96

Enclosures 45. 115 (1 plain)

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Certain Subordinates
employed on Public Works
— Forwarding for orders
with remarks. Special In-
-cursive Engineer's report
on certain charges brought
against —

E.W.

Suprs Engineer's office, Maurice,
Treichinopoly. 20th November 96.
5/29/-

Lt. Col. C. V. Boddy R.E.,
Superintending Engineer
M. Kerck

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

L. velox: 45.

I have the honor to submit for
your orders a letter No: 51 ^{P.F.} dated
6 November 1896, from the Executive
Engineer on Special Duty, Madras,
together with enclosures.

2. The Executive Engineer in his letter No: 3 P.E. dated 27 July 1896, forwarded herewith, reported to this office that he had suspended Temporary Upper Subordinate L.R. Viswanathayya on charges of bribery, extortion and cheating, and the suspension was confirmed in this office No: 983 Ind. of 29 July 1896.

The letter under reference contains the report of the Executive Engineer

on the charges he has brought against
C. R. Viswanathayya.

The enclosures comprise the defence
of C. R. Viswanathayya and all
documents necessary to decide the
case.

3. The conclusions arrived at by
the Executive Engineer are that
C. R. Viswanathayya and a
Maistry Chukrapani Pillay
should be criminally prosecuted.
That Overseer P. Balasundara
Mudaliar should be "pocketed in
the Fort St. George Gazette"; by
which I suppose he means that
the Overseer should be dismissed
and debarred from further
Government employ.

That Sub Conductor H. Slaney
should be remanded to Military
duty.

4. I have gone carefully over
all the papers connected with the
case and I find that the Executive
Engineer has made so full a report
and his reference to documents are

are so clear that it seems needless
for me to recapitulate his state-
ments and arguments.

5. Whether the evidence is suf-
ficient to justify criminal pro-
ceedings being taken against
C. R. Viswanathayya and Maistry
Chukrapani Pillay, I cannot say.

Perhaps the most serious charge is
with reference to the Chunnambur
offtake. The recorded evidence dis-
tinctly shows that C. R. Viswa-
nathayya remeasured the work
previously measured by Overseer
Balasundara Mudaliar & found
that there had been considerable
overpayments, and notwithstanding
this he proceeded to draw up 2
new bills for work done to the
amount of Rs 1075 and Rs 1100 and
submitted them for payment.
If the evidence is likely to be
accepted then the Overseer
should be criminally prosecuted.

There is also not the slightest
doubt that C. R. Viswanathayya

entered into the measurement book the measurements he took in rough books, increasing the depths of pits in many cases. But I doubt if it can be proved that he did not remeasure the pits directly into his Measurement Book as he says he did. I think that the papers should be submitted to the Government Phader at Madura and his opinion taken as to whether a criminal prosecution is advisable or not. In any case his retention in the Department is not advisable.

6. The charge against Overseer P. Balasundara Mudaliar is that he overmeasured work on the Chunnambur Offtake to the amount of Rs 3903 which amount has been paid. The Overseer's defence is that all his measurements were invariably checked by the Sub Divisional Officer & Sub Conductor Stanley who satisfied himself as to their accuracy.

Sub.

Sub Conductor Stanley however denies having checked measured any of these measurements.

The Executive Engineer is certain about his own measurements, and it may be taken as conclusively proved thereby that the charge against Overseer P. Balasundara Mudaliar is a true one. I consider that he should no longer remain in the Department.

7. As regards Sub Conductor A. Stanley there can be no doubt but that he has neglected his duties in a culpable manner. The fact that since August 1895 he has not checked measured any work done to the Chunnambur offtake and the extraordinary disposal of petitions by him as reported in para 7 of the Executive Engineer's letter goes to show this.

The Executive Engineer attributes all the circumstances

now brought to notice to his neglect
of duty and I shall be glad
if he be transferred from this
circle.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

D. V. Boddy

Lt. Col. R. E.

Superintending Engineer
VII Circle

Enclosures:

1. Special Ltr. Engrs

Letter No. 51 S. E. of

6 November 1896 with

42 Enclosures as detailed
in the Index.

* Sent per Packet
Post Registered

1. Index.

1. Special Ltr. Engrs

Engineer's Letter No. 3 S. E.

of 27 July 1896.

[Signature]
20/11

Du

These papers relate to certain charges brought by Mr. Smyth, S. E. on special duty in connection with the Penjon Channel in Madras, against Sub. Const. H. Stanley, Supervisor 1st Grade T. S. D. O., C. R. Viswanathappa, temporary upper subordinate, & P. Bolamunda, temporary upper subordinate -

C. R. Viswanathappa is a temporary man on Rs 150, & is now under suspension in connection with these charges - The S. E. on special duty has commented that he should be criminally prosecuted in conjunction with a man named Cheliasapan Pillai - The S. E. is unable to say whether the evidence is sufficient

12722
2425
3903

to satisfy a prosecution, &
he under the opinion of
the Govt. Pleader at Madras
should be taken

P. Balarama Murthy
is a temporary man on Rs 80,
is now serving in the
Trimmangalam sub division
of the Madras division -
Mr. Smyth recommends that
he should be posted in
the Fort St George Gazette,
by which the S. G. presumes
is meant that the man
should be dismissed
& relieved from further
Govt. employment. The
S. G. considers that he should
no longer remain in the
Dept.

Mr. Smyth considers
that Sub Cont. Slaney
should be remanded
to military duty.

As regards this, the
Code rules on the subject
must be considered - Para
69, Chapter V, Vol I states
that a warrant officer
cannot be remanded

to regimental duty unless he
has been reduced by sentence
of Court-martial or by order
of Govt.

To admit of Sub Cont.
Slaney's remand, he must
first be reduced to private
or private by order of Govt.,
he will then come under the
rules for non-commissioned
officers & soldiers in para 132.
It will be seen that to
admit of a man being
remanded, a detailed
statement of the evidence
must be made out, with
the defence of the accused.

No definite charges
have been framed against
Sub Cont. Slaney, nor has
his defence been taken.
He is accused of neglect
of duty in allowing the
irregularities to go on,
& of being unfit for any
responsible position in the
Dept. - Mr. Suby Sur
only recommends his transfer
from the Circle.

The three recommendations
in question stand as follows
in the List 5 half yearly

rolls:-

	1894	1894	1895	1895	1896
	1	2	1	2	1
Subland? Slaney -	R	S.R.	S.R.	R	R.
C.R. Visvanathaaya -	R	R	R	R	R
P. Balasundar Sund -	R	R	NR	R	R

Very sorry this letter goes fully
into the whole case.

For orders.

C.R.

2.12.96

Flag A

Flag B

Mr. Smyth - Executive Engineer
on Special duty in connection
with the Periyar Channel. Madura
brings certain charges against

- (1) C.R. Visvanathaaya - Temp. App. Sub.
- (2) Bolasundar Mudr. - do -
- (3) Sub-Conductor Slaney - Supervisor 1st grade.

he divides the charges into

- (1) Criminal Charges.
- (2) Departmental Charges.

Criminal Charges.

The first criminal charge is against
C.R. Visvanathaaya for extorting
Rs 10 from certain ryots of Maudur
before he would get the Maudur
bank to the water.

The evidence produced is a

1st Statement Abchi Thevan
Ambalam who states that he
paid the money.

2nd Statement of Karuppannam
Ambalam Village Munsiff of
Maudur who states that he
saw the Supervisor receive the
money.

The explanation given by C.R.
Visvanathaaya is that the
story is concocted to ruin him.
he states that when Mr. Smyth
asked the Munsiff ^{during the evening} if he was
the man. The Munsiff replied
he had not seen him. Mr.
Smyth puts ? against this
remark.

The second criminal charge is taking a bribe of Rs 100 from Contractor Echandi Aary.

Flag D.

The ~~contractor~~ contractor admits having paid Rs 100 to the Temp's overseer.

Flag B.

The overseer replies that the case is concocted.

The third case is called the Chunnambur off take. The overseer is accused of making false measurements, which resulted in an overpayment of Rs ³⁰⁹³ ~~2374~~. Mr. Smyth appears to have remeasured the work & he says he can swear to the accuracy of his measurements. Mr. Smyth says that the value of the work done is Rs 9819 against Rs 13,722 which has been paid.

Flag E

III. A.
IV. 13

It appears that Belasundra Mudr. is in first place responsible as he measured some work first. C. R. Visavannathu Lya ~~measured~~ took charge after & continued the measurements. It will be difficult to prove who is to blame. The work ought to have been ~~re~~ thoroughly re-measured when completed.

The charge against C. R. Visavannathu Lya is that he measured part of the work when he took charge &

discovering the overpayment proceeds to conceal the fact & submitted fresh bills for ~~Rs 1075~~ Rs 1100.

The case is complicated & it would certainly be advisable to put the papers into the hands of Govt. Pleader before legal action is taken.

Charges 4, 5, & 6. Mr. Smyth says are probably unprovable so action will not be taken of them.

The seventh charge is cheating in connection with the work of ~~the~~ Reach. & ~~the~~ Branch Channel.

Mr. Smyth quotes several cases in which alterations have been made in the measurement book by adding $\frac{1}{2}'$ to the depth etc.

The defence is that the measurements first taken were rough measurements just to see how the contractor was getting on & to inform his superior officers of the state the work. The overseer says the measurements in the measurement book were not copied from these rough measurements but were measured & entered direct on the field.

Departmental charges

- (1) Filling four drain Pankas without leave & thus causing a heavy loss to Govt.

July 13.

The overseer says that the books were filled without his knowledge.

The S.E. says the explanation is absurd.

(2) Disobeying all standing orders regarding measurements.

The S.E. says that this charge is self evident - & says that the measurements were copied into Govt. Books in pencil with the intent to show they are original.

The defence is that the measurements were not copied. The overseer says that measurements were made in the rough to ascertain how the contractor was getting, & that the measurements in the Govt. books are fresh measurements made in the work, hence the discrepancy between the rough measurements & those in the Govt. books.

(3) Falsifying date of measurements.

The S.E. states that measurements made in the early part of June were entered in as measured on 8th July. & states that Maistries Sundaram P. Nay & Contractor Agent both state that no measurements were made in July.

In defence the Overseer says that his progress report shows that he was measuring work on the Chumabur Off take on 6th July & that if he submitted 8th it was a slip of the pen.

(4) Insubordination. Mr. Sengupta reports that the S.D.O. at his request

wrote C.R. Viswanathan Esq. to be present at the measurement of the Chumabur Off take. & that the overseer wrote to say he was ill & would come in the afternoon if better. The overseer did appear ran off into Madurai. Mr. Sengupta followed him into Madurai & says that the overseer did not go near the District Surgeon or Dispensary, but says he was suffering from Dyspepsia. Again on 3rd Nov. Mr. Sengupta had to go to Madurai & immediately his back was turned the overseer left a child to say his child was ill & went away again. The third time left his charge without permission.

Later on the overseer appears before Mr. Sengupta with a vakil & asked permission to lay a complaint against him. Mr. Sengupta says ^{the overseer} he did this to irritate him. Mr. Sengupta told the overseer he must get the permission of Govt. if he (the overseer) wanted to prosecute. The overseer then became insolent & Mr. Sengupta "shut him up pretty sharp".

The defence is that he was really ill in the first occasion & went to consult his family doctor, & that in the 2nd occasion his daughter was really ill. Nothing is said in defence of his bringing a vakil & being insolent. The overseer states that he was with Mr. Sengupta during the time from 30th July to 3rd Aug while Mr. Sengupta

was measuring the Chambers
off take -

5th Having objectionable pecuniary
transactions with Contractors

In the common note book there
are some entries on pages 49, 50
54, 60, 62. which Mr. Smyth
says represent advances made
by the overseer to contractors
& chiefly to a contractor named
Amadrasaigee. On page 62
a total is made up of the amounts
& the words "Amount bank" is
put before it. It is very likely
therefore that the overseer did
have monetary transactions
with the contractors -

On page 2 of Penny Note
Book. There are some transactions
entered in Tamil -

& lower down in English -

"amount up to date 12.11.86
in Bank & with R.R.S. - 4800

Rs lent to Otta as per R.R.S. letter dated 8/11/94.	500
	524.00

A translation has been made
in this office of this page &
pinned on to the page -

With regard to lending
money to the contractors the
overseer does not deny this
but says he lent ^{small sums of} money
if they had come from a
distance which was returned

Flag - XXIV

Flag XXV

again in a few days without
interest.

With regard to sums deposited
in the Coimbatore Bank &
in Brothers in law's shop
there is no explanation, now
instituted.

Bolesandra Mudr. is said to
have made false measurements of
the work before Visaramathas dyes
lot charge. Mr. Smyth calls
on him for his explanation &
his reply is that all his
measurements were checked
by the S.D.O. & he cannot
conceive how the Special Surveyor
has arrived at less measurements.

XXX

The criminal charges with the

Evidence collected by Mr. Smyth
against C. R. Visaramathas dyes
(a) should be laid before the Govt.
at Madras

Phadnis & his opinion taken before
prosecution is sanctioned.

His services should be at
once dismissed Govt. service
as it is plain that he has had
pecuniary transactions with Contractors
& has been indiscreet & unwise
to his superior officers.

The evidence against Bolesandra
Mudr. is feeble. Mr. Smyth himself
does not seem to think that he
could be proved guilty if
prosecuted. However his conduct
has laid him open to suspicion

and he should be informed accordingly
the En. Surf. asked to keep check
look out on him -

No definite charges have been
brought against Sgt. Frederick
Stacey. He is said to have
been careless, & lazy & not
to have ^{made} check measurements
but just to have ridden
along the banks of the
channel & stated he had
"inspected". He has already
been called on for an explanation
by this office & his case will
be disposed of when this
explanation is received.
Mr. Smyth apparently has
not called on him for
any explanation -

177
5.12.86.

I think the opinion of the En. Surf.

as to whether there is a canyons.

C. D. Varnum Jr. is on the charge

and there is a departmental inquiry in

L. Nelson.

5/12/86

P.W.D.

Note for His Excellency the Governor

* Flag A

Mr. T. W. S. Smyth, Executive Engineer on special duty in connection with the Periyar channels in Madras, brings certain charges against the following three Upper subordinates:—

(1) Temporary Supervisor C. R. Viswanatha Aiyar

(2) Temporary Overseer P. Balasundrum Mudaliar

(3) Sub Conductor H. Slaney, Supervisor 1st grade.

The charges against No. (2) & (3) will be dealt with separately, & this Note is confined to the accusations made against C. R. Viswanatha Aiyar, who is a Temporary Supervisor on Rs 1000 has been under suspension since the July 1896.

There are no less than 9 criminal charges and 5 departmental charges brought against this subordinate. Some of the criminal charges are unprovable

A.E. 18-5-97

unprovable, but there is ample evidence to justify the dismissal of the Supervisor from the public service. It is ^{however} unnecessary to consider more than the following three criminal charges, the evidence in support of which is sufficient for a criminal prosecution:—

1st Criminal charge - Extorting Rs 10 from certain ryots of Marudur before he would fill the tank with water.

2nd Criminal charge - Taking a bribe of Rs 100 from Contractor Ichandi asari.

3rd Criminal charge - This is called the Chunarbar off take case & is a complicated one. The charge against the Supervisor is that knowing that contractor P. Doraiswamy had already been overpaid for certain work, he concealed the fact & submitted 2 bills for Rs 1075 & Rs 1100 respectively for payment which he knew ought not to be submitted for payment and thereby abetted the contractor

in

* Flag B

* Flag C

Flag D

3 Flag E

in cheating Govt.

The papers were referred to the Suptg. Engineer with Memo dated 8th Dec. 96, and he was requested to obtain the opinion of the Govt. Pleader, Madras, as to whether a case against the Supervisor on the criminal charge brought by Mr. Sanyal was likely to be proved.

The Govt. Pleader, Madras, is of opinion that "although the evidence is sufficient to produce a moral conviction in one's mind that the officer has behaved dishonestly, it is wanting to secure a legal conviction in a criminal Court of Justice."

The undersigned was not disposed to accept the opinion of this official as final, and the papers were therefore referred to the Govt. Pleader, Madras, by Memo No. 1548 C of 18th March 1897.

It will be seen that the Govt. Pleader, Madras, considers that a ^{prima} facie case is disclosed against C.R. Viswanatha Aiyar in regard to the three criminal charges mentioned above.

A draft order sanctioning the

prosecution of the Supervisor is
being submitted for approval.

Mr Smyth proposes to
engage Maistry Chakrapani Pillai
with C. R. Viswanatha Aiyar as
an accessory and with conspiracy.

Neither of the Law officers to whom
the papers were referred have offered
any remarks on the case against
this man. The result of the prosecu-
tion of C. R. Viswanatha might be
awaited before steps are taken
against the maistry.

If the prosecution be sanctioned,
it seems desirable to take
precautions against the employment
as Crown Prosecutor, of the
Government Pleader at
Madurai, as that official
having stated as his opinion, that
there is no case, would not be
likely to make the most of the
charges, and that there is too
knowing but that he may already
have been consulted by the
Superior himself.

18/5/97

It seems it would be necessary
to employ the local Govt. Pleader,
but the case must be carefully
watched by the local Officers, to
see that it is properly put forward
and pursued home.

9.9.97 5.11.97

Cu 566
du

For orders.
This case was
noted on in the
papers attached to
mem. no 4699C
of 8.12.96, immediately
below the current.

Current no 11040
near the bottom of the
file relative to this
case.

Current no 4603C
of 4.12.96 (below
Current no 11040) is
connected with a
different case in
the same locality.

no reply has been
received to mem. no
4603C of 9.6.97. The
original papers were
sent with it to S. J.
S. J. Sub. Const. Shandy
has since been transferred
to S. J. C.

A reminder
might be
sent.
Current
25/97

There seems to have been
a most stuporous mistake
to be made, if possible, for
the bottom of it. I do not
consider that the present
pleader's opinion should
finally settle the matter, nor
do I understand how that
the evidence is insufficient to
secure a legal conviction. I
do not suppose that the
examined the bills submitted
by the Property Supervisor.
They are important documents.
I might be asked to
furnish them.

copy
26.1.97

Order

From

The Supper Inquest
March

No. 35 Ind.

Dated 16 January 1897.

Received 18. 1. 97

Enclosures 115 (Sent separately)

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Submitting copy of the

from the York. Phad.

Inaduna, informing the

the charges against—

Cannot be proved in
Baptist Church

Court of law and res.
-missing for orders the

papers connected with

the same.



W.

Mr.

11 Where is Sub-Conductor
Mancy's explanation?

2) Was he transferred to
N. Prater - the favorite
business - as a punishment?

C. M. M.

2597.

sw

DW
(17) The file contains charges
against temporary upper
Sulawesi C. R.
— and 8

Microdon
Visvanatha Singh &
P. Balasubrahmanya
& their explanation were
taken -

Taken -
no definite charges
were framed against
Sarkis, Wright & Laney -
The Gov. says it was
all up

able to make up
his mind whether the
S. D. was ignorant
or otherwise of
the going

* or over
What was going
on, & he pronounced
the report for

on 14
him to be infit- for
responsible for
the only letter

Hecker

Rev. D. D. C.

1/2 x 1/4

15 min

Dec 15/90

of the 4
- 100

with

судра

Case 11.

100

in the file from the Slaves
and those marked VC,
V D & V E in the
bundle of cables -

The papers relating
to the case of Slaves
transferred to the Court
are submitted in a
limited file - I am
not aware why
we close the case
as the Court should
be should be
transferred.

25.1.27

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

Letter from Mr. R. Ry. Mr. S. Narayana-
- Sanny Aiyar, Agent, Government
Pleader, Madras, to the Superintendents of
Circle, No. 29 dated 14th January 1897.

In reply to yours no 1566. M. D.
dated the 14th December 1896, I have the
honor to state that I have carefully
perused all the papers connected with
the charges against Temporary Upper
Subordinate C.R. Viswanatha Aiyar
and have had also the benefit of a
personal consultation with the Special
Deputy Engineer, Madras, and my
opinion is that although the evidence
is sufficient to produce a moral conviction
in one's mind that the officer has
behaved dishonestly, it is wanting
to secure a legal conviction in a
Criminal Court of Justice. So far
as charges no 102 are concerned I
have indicated my reasons for the
above conclusion in my letter no 267
dated 29th September 1896 to the Special Deputy
Engineer (no ~~LIX~~ in the Index sent to
me by you) As regards charge no 3
(Chinnambur offtake case) there is
no strong independent evidence and
what

What evidence there is, is really that
of persons who are ill-disposed towards
the Superintendents, and it would be difficult
to induce a Court of Justice to convict
the man upon that testimony. Thus
my opinion on the 3 Criminal Charges
is that they are not likely to be proved
in a Court of Justice

No. 35 Ind.

Copy, Submitted to the
Chief Engineer, R.W.D., for information,
with reference to his memorandum
No. 4699.C dated 8th December 1896, the
enclosures of which are herewith
returned.

O. G. R. Oddy, Lieut Col R.
Superintendent of Circle

Superintendent's office
to be sent
16 January 1897
8/16

Inc. 115

* Sent sepa.
- rately per
Book Post.
(Registered)
* Sent to office
for O. G. R. Oddy
21.12.96

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 4063

From
The Government Engineer,
Madras.

Order

No. 358

Dated 23rd
Received 26th April 1897
Registered 26th
Enclosures 2
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Recommending the prosecution of
C. N. Sivarama Iyer, a Temporary Upper
Subordinate, Madras Div.

O. G. R. Oddy

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

Government Pleader's Office,

HIGH COURT,

Madras, 23rd April 1894.

~~No.~~ 35-2

From

E. B. POWELL, Esq.,

GOVERNMENT PLAIDER,

Madras,

To

THE Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department.

SIR,

With reference to your letter N^o 1528 B. of the 18th
March 1897, I have the honor to submit the following:—

Opinion.

1. I think a prima facie case is disclosed against E. R. Viswanatha Dyer in regard to

- (1) Marudur Tank extortion case.
- (2) Contractor Echaudy Aray's case.
- (3) Chumnambur offtake case.

2/. I presume the enquiry made by the Executive Engineer does not profess to be by any means exhaustive and that its object has been to ascertain whether the Petitions received from him could be substantiated.

3. As regards the first charge I think the statements

of the persons examined by the Executive Enquiries sufficiently support the Pethon and make out a case under Sections 161 and 383 of the Indian Penal Code. The Local Government Pleader seems to think that the statement of the Village Munsiff is not to be believed, because he does not profess to be an eye witness in his Pethon. I observe the Pethon is a joint one by the Shurman and Village Munsiff and the facts stated in it are stated in general terms. It is omission to state in the Pethon that he was an eye witness himself does not detract from his evidence, provided it is otherwise not open to question.

4. As regards the second charge—the allegations in the Pethon that, Rs 100 was paid to Visvanatha Dyer to get him to show favor to the contractor in the exercise of his official functions, is borne out by the persons who are said to have been present. I see nothing improbable in the story.

5. The Executive Enquiries say that the rough measurements are found in the Supervisor's note book and on the same page measurement of similar work done by Niyachi Ambalam which have been copied into measurement book n^o $\frac{44}{2520}$ page 34, but with an increase in the height of $\frac{1}{2}$ foot, whereas those of Eachandi Asari are copied correctly.

6. The Executive Enquiries does not say whether the entry or entries in the note book throw any light in the way of corroboration on the statements of Eachandi Asari and the other three witnesses. I have looked at the entries myself and can gather no information whatever from them.

7. Lastly as regards the Shurmanbur offtake case, the allegation here is that ^{Visvanatha Dyer} knowing that contractor T. Doraisamy had already been overpaid for certain work concealed the fact and submitted 2 bills for Rs 1075 and Rs 1100 respectively for payment which he knew ought not to be submitted for payment and thereby abetted the contractor in cheating Government.

8. The evidence in support of this charge is that of Sundram Pillai and Veerasamy Naidu. Both say they were present at the time of remeasurement by Visvanatha Dyer and that they assisted him in making the measurements. They also say that they remarked to him how much the work had been overmeasured but they were told to mind their own business. Doraisamy Dyer and Subramania Dyer state that they assisted in working out the calculations when the measurements were taken, and they identify one of the sheets found among Visvanatha Dyer's records as one of those used for making the calculation. Added to this is the fact that the overmeasurements were made in places where it is impossible to believe they were made by carelessness or mistake.

9. The Local Government Pleader says there is a want of strong independent evidence and that the witnesses are ill-disposed towards the accused and

14
it would be hard to get a Court to believe their story.
I cannot take the same view. There may not be strong
independent evidence but is there such evidence that
a Court could act upon. Undoubtedly a fraud had
been committed which must have been apparent to any
one remeasuring the work. If the witnesses are to be
believed, the fraud was actually brought to the notice of
Visvanatha Dyer. There seems to be no sufficient reason
why all four of the above witnesses should have
combined to make the statement that they were present
when Visvanatha Dyer made the measurements unless
it was a fact. No doubt Visvanatha Dyer makes a
general allegation of hostility against all the witnesses,
but I think the Executive Engineer has shown it has
no foundation.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Yours most obed^t Serv^t,

W. Town

Government Pleader

1848
18-37
Mr. Snythe, Executive Engineer
Periyar works brings 9 criminal
and 5 departmental charges
against Temporary Supervisor
Vivramatha Aiyar. But unless
it be intended to prosecute
the Supervisor criminally it
seems scarcely worth while to
investigate all these charges in
detail. Therefore these charges
only have been investigated
in the accompanying note -
the criminal and the
departmental - and these
seem sufficient to justify the
dismissal of the subordinate
without subsistence allowance
during the period of his
suspension. It should, however,
be noted that the Executive Engineer's
charges appear in a
of later date than that of the
Supervisor's defence: and if the
former's letter were sent to the
accused he might argue that
he had not seen them before

C. S. R., a month's pay
 may be granted in
 lieu of notice - By
 doing this, the man may
 be got rid of
 once.

C.

26.2.97

W.

As subsistence allowance
 can not be claimed as a
 right, but is granted only
 as an act of grace, there
 is apparently no reason
 for allowing it, for the
 man has placed himself
 outside the pale of favorable
 consideration of any kind, and
 the object should, it is
 thought, be to get rid of
 him as cheaply as possible.
 He will, apparently, have to
 be paid from 1st to 27th ^{have}
 July, and for a month's

W has decided that
 the services of temporary
 Supervisor C. R. Viswanatha
 aya are to be dispensed
 with on a month's notice,
 & dispense

Before drafting
 orders on the following
 points are required -

Viswanatha aya
 was suspended on the
 27th July 1896 - There
 is no account from the
 Sui office that pay
 has been passed to
 him up to 30th June
 1896 - He has not
 yet been granted his
 pay from 1st to
 27th July 1896, and no
 subsistence allowance
 whatever has been
 passed to him.

In discharging
 him, it is proposed
 that his pay from 1st

been of notice if
decided not to let him
work out the month. Perhaps
that might be left to
the discretion of the
Superintendent who may be
able to put him on some
work where he can neither
scamp nor cheat.

C.M.B.

28.2.97.

to 27th July 1907. He dis-
missed.

What comes under
question of subsistence
allowance - The note
to Art. 215 (a) C.S. Regu-
lates that subsistence
allowance is authorized on
a matter of grace only
& cannot be claimed
as of right. It also
says that the allowance may
be granted to a temporary
employee, if the author-
ity suspending him
considers that some allow-
ance should be given. Orders
are required whether the
usual subsistence allowance
should or should not
be granted to the temporary
employee.

Now, if the temporary
superintendent is given an
month's notice, should
he be required to
work it out. This
course would perhaps
not be desirable -
under Art. 384 (2)

W.

1848 C
18-3-97
Mr. Sanyal, Executive Engineer
Periyar works brings 9 criminal
and 8 departmental charges
against Temporary Superintendent
Vivramatha Nigam. But unless
it be intended to prosecute
the Superintendent criminally it
seems scarcely worth while to
investigate all these charges in
detail. Therefore these charges
only have been investigated
in the accompanying note -
the criminal and the
departmental - and then
seem sufficient to justify the
dismissal of the Subordinate
without subsistence allowance
during the period of his
suspension. It should, however,
be noted that the Executive Engineer's
charges appear in a
of later date than that of the
Superintendent's defence: and if the
former's letter were sent to the
accused he might argue that
he had not seen them before

framed in the same words. To make matters perfectly safe the Supervisor might be asked

(1) To harmonize his statement that he might have advanced a few rupees to contractors who had come from a distance with the evidence, which appears in his note-books, that he had been systematically paying considerable sums of money to Annadwa Aiyar.

(2) To explain how he became possessed of Rs 5400 in October 1896 when his pay was only Rs 100 a month.

It will, I am afraid, in any case be necessary to investigate a fourth charge, and by far the most complicated one of the lot, namely that connected with the Channambur off-take. Because it is alleged that Temporary Overseer, Balasundra Mudali is implicated in that case, and it is necessary to see whether the charge made against that Subordinate can be proved.

The Government Pleader at

Madras considers that a conviction could not be obtained in a Court of Justice. As he speaks only in reference to Criminal charges I, II and III. It seems a question whether the opinion of this official should be accepted as final. The Government Solicitor, who has not been asked for his opinion, might take a different view of the case.

C.H.M.
16.3.97.

Office note

The following are important documents & should be carefully kept in the file:-
5 sample measurement sheets
3 P.W.D. note-books
1 small diary, note-book

C.H.M.
16.3.97.

Would it be in order to ask the opinion of the Govt Pleader

16/3/97

The Govt. Pleader at Madras, is the officer appointed to advise the Govt. of Dept. in legal cases. The papers may be referred to him for opinion, if desired.

C.H.M.
16.3.97

12
that he had a share in the contract or a contract, and that - as he was not
to it after by his substantial officer - he was in intentioned superintendence
of his own work. This, though stated as a departmental charge, but it should be borne in
perhaps he converted into a serious criminal charge. But it should be borne in
mind that he had \$3400 as wages as Oct 3 1894, and that therefore he
must have necessarily augmented that sum by subsequent irregularities. There can be
no real doubt in his having, for long, been bypassed in a big scandal, while the evidence
that he was accountable have perhaps dealing with certain fraudulent charges
seems indisputable.

Contd 8.97.
(5. 8. 97.)

will turn to persons who had come from a distance, and were in immediate need
 of funds to make them to make a commencement. The paper, which are presumably
 "the Captains' or land-siding, show that the statement is false. That if we try to
 find out the truth, we find a Tami Rely on the second sheet that "we are a
 deposit of \$250 with Francisco Chiles. It is thus translated as a copy of paper
 passed in "deposit in the hands of Francisco Chiles. \$3250." and dated
 19-10-54. When this shows that the deposit was not included in the other
 advances. Therefore Francisco Chiles must have received at least \$2000 + \$1000
 or at least \$410-12. It is quite curious, therefore, that the receipt of
 been not sufficient to pay him a distance, for this is how we receive the
 money from the depositors from October 1894 to December 1895 at least. It seems therefore
 quite unnecessary to suppose that the depositors had \$5700 put away. Is this
 in the accounts. It is also shown that the depositors had \$100, and it was not all
 1894 when he deposited \$250 with the Captain's his pay was \$100, and it was not all
 November 1895 that he received from the Captain's his pay was \$100, and it was not all
 November 1895 is dated 6th Nov 1896, and with the Francisco Chiles' letter for the
 dated 31-10-96. But it seems doubtful whether the depositors had not been called on
 charges retention as promised. The depositors, or they should be with "Balthus" as
 explanation would be forthcoming. "The letter is of the depositors had not been called on
 for \$5700. But he, drawing from \$100 to \$150 per annum, was unable to put by to
 meet the money. But since it is submitted that there is no reason to believe

has received many thousands
of letters of work on the X Press,
and other works. The other work
(heavy pattern) shows that
kind of profit he has been
making in the past & is
very things that a substantial
of \$250 per week should
be working deposits, in the
name of his system in law with
a Clerk in the name of
several thousand papers.
Doubtless are explanation and
be fully coming.

10
have happened that some of the
criticisms, being seen, we have
come from distant parts of the
country to take up the work, were
in need of small sums. Being
to their disappointment request
they have sent them a few
purses to be, as a rule, returned
within a few days of the giving
of the loan. I think we may fear
that work being delayed. In
taking the logs down a natural
man with a view to keep them
entirely in the work's undertaker
to them. They & doubt that I
had no intention of keeping up any
pecuniary transactions with them
or any idea of getting interest or
anything of the sort from them."

Page 54. Chest. 1891

Penicillium, heads 12/1.. Pos
Aspergillus - - - " 20
 M. N. B (alligata) - - - 2
Chaetomium - - - - 3

Page 60 . 1

13-11-95 - Frustrated -

Page 62. beidsr

Stenocercus "1" - - -
Vallecula *Theraps* - - -

Rayburn June 10

January 20 - - - - - 10

Raymond Kelcei - 10
Quentin - - - - 2

These items - which are written
in blue pencil, apparently to show
that they are bona & authentic
to Vol 6 P^o 284-12. While
the names of the authors & titles
amount to P^o 160-12. And the
Executive Officer says that
this individual has presented
many thousands of papers
and papers. But the
deposits were had and
believe that he has sent only

There are nine criminal charges and five departmental charges against Supervisor, Liviana A. Hiss: but under criminal prosecution is contemplated it is hardly worth the time which will be required merely to investigate the case in the same way. If the Justice be asked are dismissal with or without subsistence allowance probably an additional charge will decide the point. The following charge is therefore stated:—

Departmental charge

V. Having objectionable pecuniary dealings with relatives

The Executive Engineer writes as follows:—“The Mr. Hiss has been advanced money by the Government, who

The following is the Supervisor's reply:—“In regard to this I beg to submit that I have no objection to his receiving the money. Since money is repaid—

at the expense of Government it should be required to be repaid to the same. But as this is a case, it may be accepted as the absence of further evidence Charge II has not been brought home in the same way as Charge I.

The following are prices from the Little (Hiss) 1 Mr. Hiss. Balance ~~XXV~~
Page 49
2.5-95. Standard Hiss. Rs 50
2.5-95
Page 50
26-6-95 - Standard Hiss " 15

and asked him (whether) for a
loan of \$25 to make up
the sum demanded: but within
days that he had no money &
returned him to V. Shabalam who
was upstairs and asked him to
bring a line Eastward came down,
& when asked him whether he
had paid the \$250 in full and
paid the supervisor & he said that
he had done it.

The receipt of work done by
Eastward & also of work done by
one of his assistants were
taken down officially by the supervisor
in his note-book - page paper 15617.
Feb. XXV - The receipt by which
says that the measurement of
Eastward's work has been copied
as they are in the measurement
book, but that none of Shabalam's
work have been measured in the
height by half a foot, and that
therefore it is probable that
the contractor paid the supervisor
for as the latter for what he
wanted he makes no complaint.

8

Measurements are stated to
have been copied - with allowed
in the case of Shabalam's work, &
in favor of the contractor who is
represented by Mr. Shabalam to have
"guaranteed" the supervisor - is not the
the file and we can see with
what the value of the work done
may be. It does not seem to
have been large, and unless
Eastward had otherwise been
paid for it is not clear that
it would have been worth his
while to pay a bill of \$100. The
evidence at hand is not sufficient
to give a decided opinion on this
point: that is to say there is
no absolute proof without it
that the amount due to
Eastward was large enough to
warrant payment of \$100: but
if it is true that the supervisor has
promised to add it to the bill by
settling these measurements
that value the man must be nearly
a man, but of a certain kind
the supervisor has the power

These notes called Viram
Mutham of Madras' figures
to the Treasury and state their
statement; and state that
the latter had only Rs 25 with
him and so borrowed Rs 25 from
their officers to make up the
required amount and that he
paid the full Rs 100 in the
of a house a Madras in
presence of officers, and one
Madras with some
other charges and the
same Madras were taking
to get the document. It is not
quite clear when the house was
Viramacha taken or the latter
charge; but apparently it was
in the house of the former that
the sale is alleged to have been made.
Witness of Madras' corroborate
the above evidence in every respect.
Necessary to state that the
fact that he was Madras, and
that Madras of any other

Yes. The Supervisor's
house. correct.

Although
none of the students
then to have been with
price-unless and more.

him, but also succeeded
the same influence on the
Contraction in the work. Thus
he could have the credit
for the success of the conspiracy
set on foot by a couple of
maillards and a boy-clerk,
the agents of the conspirators
being in the case a set of
hypocrites, and in the other
set of Contraction. It can
be seen he supposed that
any body would accept
such a defence.

Then why did he take his
measures? as the whole
work is silent of this
measures? work? Just
a procedure is against all
rules. Unfortunately measures
work $\frac{44}{256}$ without the work

II Receiving a note of \$100 from
Guicelis' Lachand's Stany, in
the presence of these witnesses.

[Note Feb 2, III 4, III 8, III C, and III D.]
 The Guicelis' evidence, which was
 taken down by the Judge in person,
 is to the effect that the Copanites
 witnessed to give them money
 + two notes for certain work done
 under paid \$100: but that if paid
 \$100 he would over-receive the work
 actually to over the \$100. However
 the Guicelis state that he paid the
 note demanded; but that as, after
 all, he could not get the Copanites
 to receive his work properly he
 made the complaint. He claims
 that he paid him the money and
 says that he did do a 3rd work
 1896.

However, Belandron must know
 the real value of the work in the
 work, and Viviantha Stigars had been
 an Orino till Nov 1894: so we are
 sure and have been referred to.]

Viviantha Stigars disposes
 of this charge by affirming that
 it is concocted by individuals
 known above - M. Subramanian
 Stigars, Sundram Pillai and
 Viraswami Naidu. Lachand's
 Stany, Viran Ambalam Sivian
 and Ponnusami Pillai are,
 he alleges, disinterested en-
 tireties and at present with
 him owing to his strict control
 of their work & that P. Pillai
 had petitioned against him
 September some time ago.

with the very line of his defense
 this is all the more is an
 exception against himself through
 personal animosity. Besides, even
 the evidence taken from the Judge,
 was given by Subalam the owner of
 the station, and another village
 of the same name, and not by the
 Challenger.

On the first page of Viviantha
 Stigars' defense - Vol 5 I - he
 writes to the effect that Mr.
 Subramaniam Stigars, formerly
 a clerk under him, but now a
 clerk under the present manager
 is the instigator of his
 conspiracy. There is a little
 in that charge, but the real
 the effect that this individual
 is a boy of 19 or 20. The Judge
 would have me believe that
 this kind of a conspiracy
 was not, with the help of
 conspirators, persuaded the
 village of Manasse to
 make false charges against

that Miranda
has received the petition
of Sub. Antonio Plana
and the same for report,
16th January 1896.

H.
As since the September 1890,
for when the Petitioner was
seized by you in the market
Village, and in my presence
questioned whether I was the
owner of the property referred to
in the petition, he replied that
he had not seen me. Again
this time is a note of
the Petitioner's appearance, in
the handwriting of Mr. J. J. S. J.

Since he stands to make definite
charge in a petition to a magistrate
for fear of implicating themselves.
As this is a case of oppression, they
might have preferred to make a
formal accusation rather than
make a statement to the Court.
They had actually been paid.
But the statement taken down in
the Court's hand-writing, (now
in the hands of the Court) dated 28-7-96
or 29 days after the report
of the Municipality and the Court to
the Court's statement shows that
the village had become less
opinion of speaking out: for
Antonio Plana of the market says,
"I myself paid the money, it is
a statement of the Court, also taken
down by the Court the Court's
says "I know personally, that
the person told me a few
days before the date of the
report that the Court's statement
was not his but the Court's.
The statement against the Court's

St. Louis - Ex: XVI -

very heavy duty
element of Kansas and
"attorneys of the charged"
the Executive by the State

we are buying the Separators and that the Separators should be essential for filling them with oil without loss. Wherever the Separator requires work the Separator should have been there but the work has been done, but the Separator should do so.

the former day! that as
radically evident
of the others

born as Voltaire
received the petition of the
people, he set about settling up
the accounts. Their and
even the rulers in his noble-born.
May, referring
to Vol. II it will

3.

and leaving the letter to witness
the necessity, Harman and some
of the agents of Chapman to construct
charges him. The supervisor Suber
the following reasons to show that
the charges are well-founded:-

(a) That the Nathaniel and someone
do not state, is a person with
2. 7-96 returned to the Deputy
Collector that the villagers had
paid Rs 10 or that the Superintendent
had advanced Rs 20 but that
there is a rumor that the
Deputy Collector has been after
receiving Rs 10 or Rs 15 for each

16]. That the report in addition
to being silent regarding the names
of the persons who made the
payment, and that no were
present at the time is alone
silent in regard to closing the
account after allowing the
day's deposit.

That there is the case of Sunderman
Pillai, who is apparently a different
individual from Sunderman (Pillai)
the Agot. In fact a reference to
page 4 of the Supervisor's explanation
with these three different people
the Supervisor states the Sunderman
Pillai, the Secretary, Vasundhara, (a
dismissed Secretary) & Mr. Seth Amurthy
(a clerk in the Revenue Department)
After & forwardly under the Supervisory
conclude the charge with Sunderman
Pillai the Agot as a superior.
There is ample evidence adduced to
show that there has been no violation
of there is no evidence to show that
they executed the case. In fact it
shows undoubtedly that they could have
done so, for they could also have
had & sought the Secretary, the
Revenue & other officers of Madras
who have seen evidence as to the
pastwork of the revenue.

As regards the Superior Courts (a) and (b) & how that the charges are withdrawn. It is submitted that these officials

[Faint, mostly illegible handwriting on the reverse side of the page, likely bleed-through from the other side.]

paid him \$20.
 at him by
 paper made in the track -
 found and paid him \$10,
 keeping back half his money
 demanding till they should
 receive the water. Suburban
 \$20 that he himself paid him
 \$10, and he gave it to him
 so was him do so. It is possible
 alleged that the supervisor
 would not see after this,
 not the water, referring to the
 till they paid the balance.
 Therefore the reported the
 water to the Bureau and
 Mattamoras of the village.
 This distance is considerable
 by the village. Himself who
 says that he, for me, has the
 money paid
 On page 29 of one of the

lands were submerged, &
 that he had lost over \$5000
 in expenses: but the
 supervisor having reported
 against him, finally there by
 broke, resulting in his
 getting others in his side
 to convert them charges.
 It would seem that Suburban
 Pillai - who is referred to in
 page 8, 9 & 10 of the supervisor's
 report, vide 31-10-96. Sub: I -
 is or was also a residing in
 the Chamber of State, and
 that he reported, on 15th Aug, 1896,
 that Overseer Balakrishna had
 had made an over payment to
 Cincin Dwarana Aiyar, adding
 the value of five direct - which
 apparently caused him to
 leaving, if possible the finally
 what had already said
 between the supervisor and mainly

these fact or to with an
 state bank causing the petitioners
 lands in the Fore State to be
 submerged. This petition was sent to
 the Collector's Office for report by
 the 2nd July, on 18th Jan 1896. There
 and was report in the subject - not
 from the Collector's Office, and
 has been from the supervisor. The latter
 advances evidence to show that the
 total area of the lands in the
 Fore State amounts to 210 acres
 which petitioners own only thirty
 and states that the land was
 given by a deed dated 14th Feb-
 1891 for which the day, and
 then the land was worked away -
 so the land can have been
 done in the time. This statement
 is substantiated by statement by
 Sub. Collector's Office. However
 this does not prove the case
 of have been executed: it
 only shows that they were
 given by the State and
 finally between Suburban
 Pillai and Dwarana Aiyar.

L. O. No. 252
Public Works (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. *11040*

Order

From

C. R. Novanathiah
Supervisor.

No. -

Dated *3. 12. 96*

Received *5. 12. 96*

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

*Forwarding, with remarks,
certain papers connected
with the charges brought
against him by the
Special Executive Engineer
Periyar works.*

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

2

The Chief Engineer and Secretary
to Government, P.W.D. Madras

Most Honoured Sir

I respectfully beg to state, that the Special Executive Engineer, Periar works framed certain charges against me on 10th September 96 of which 9 were Criminal and 5 were Departmental. I submitted my explanations as regards those charges on 31st October 96. I have submitted, that the charges were framed on misrepresentations made by my subordinates, discontented Contractors and others. Since I had to enter fully into all the circumstances of the case, and the above misrepresentations, my explanations have become lengthy. So I beg your honour's kind permission to append herewith a statement in a tabular form, giving -

1. No. of the Charge
2. Details of the Charge
3. Papers relating to them
4. Reference to the para. of the Charges in the Explanation

Besides, I beg to be permitted to give some of the circumstances which may shew that the Special Executive Engineer is prejudiced against me from the very beginning.

They are as follows:—

P. T. O

They are as follows:—

1. The offhand manner in which I was suspended by the Special Executive Engineer on the 25th of July, merely believing in the words of my enemies, the discontented & unscrupulous subordinates and contractors and without asking my explanations.
2. The said suspension order was based amongst other general charges, on "knowingly making a false report regarding Vellari Tank". This definite charge is not found in the list of charges which I was asked to explain on the 10th of September. The Vellari Tank affair was disposed of unfavourably to the petitioner J. M. Sundram Pillai, by the Special Executive Engineer himself long before I was suspended i.e. on the 4th of July.
3. The above petitioner J. M. Sundram Pillai a ryot of Vellaripatti was instrumental in bringing again the Vellaripatti Tank affair mentioned in the suspension order dated 25th July. I submit the records connected with the Vellari Tank affair.
4. In regard to the various Criminal and Departmental Charges, there were no complaints by any one on or before the date of suspension.
5. The Special Executive Engineer without any basis except the oral misrepresentations of Clerk Subramanya Aiyar & others entered my house on the 25th July forcibly took away all my records and other private

private papers and things without asking me to deliver the office papers to him. This I represented to the Superintending Engineer VIth Circle in my letters dated 3rd & 6th August 96 and also in person.

6. My clerk Subramanya Aiyar was suspended by Mr. Joyce the Executive Engineer in the middle of July last on my report. And the Special Executive Engineer was then asked to communicate the same to S.D.O. The suspension order was not communicated to the clerk by the Special Executive Engineer. The period of absence without leave of clerk from 5th to 14th July was treated as one of casual leave and on duty by the Special Executive Engineer on the 10th of August. For the services rendered I beg to submit herewith the records connected with this.

7. Maestrie Verasawmy Chaidu who was dismissed on the 2nd of July by the Special Executive Engineer himself and partly on whose misrepresentations some of the charges were framed was reinstated in the said post of Maestrie by the Special Executive Engineer recently for the singular services rendered by him.

8. My previous service, the testimonials which my superiors were good enough to give me, My promotions from Rs 80 to Rs 150 in the

to Rs 150 in the Temporary Establishment within a period of seven years and further recommendations for promotions prior to the date of suspension, and the fact that the Special Executive Engineer, only a few days after his taking charge from Mr. Joyce has thought it fit to suspend me without asking for my explanation

9. The above misrepresentations have been made by my enemies to the Special Executive Engineer about the month of July after they began to entertain some personal grievance or other, and when they in consequence wanted to get the good opinion and favor of the Special Executive Engineer.

The records noted in Paras 3 & 6 are separately submitted in Packet Post for your honour's kind perusal & return - as they are the certified copies -

I beg to remain

Most Honourable Sir

Your most obedient servant

C. P. Viswanathaiah

Supervisor D. B. S.

Kistna row Teppakulam Street

Madura

No. 5244 C

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Madras, 27th July 1897.

OFFICE NOTE.

From W

To C

^{connection}
In continuation with certain charges against temporary Supervisor C. R. Viswanatha aiyar, please forward for reference, all bills submitted by ^{the} Supervisor for work done on the "Chunnambur offtake" in the Periyar sub-division of the Madura division.

29/7/97

sd/ J.C.
W.

29/7

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1443

Order

From *C.R. Visvanatha Aiyar*
Superintendent, P.W.D.,
Madurai

No. 5

Dated 5.2.97

Received 7.2.97

Enclosures 2

Spare copies "

SUBJECT.

*Praying for the early
disbursement of certain
pay and allowances due
to him.*

Laid 11 December 1857
Hatched 12 — — —

...received from S.D.O. on
wholesale, issued to the Piecemaker Eachandi
Asari, and from whom the other Piecemakers,
Annadurai Aiyar, Parasurama Chettiar and
Siyaschi Ambalam have received according
to their demands; and these have been subsequently
adjusted in their Bills upon the production of
Receipts.

5. In the Progress Report of works given
to Sub-overseer Suleramannier, I have also stated
that lots of explosives are to be recovered from
Eachandi Asari as per Balance Account
kept in my Office, and that no Bill should
be granted in his favour before this account
is settled.

Under the circumstances stated above,
I submit, that I am not answerable for
the amount as S.D.O. reports.

I beg to remain
Sir

Yours most obedt. Servant

C. A. Viswanathaiah

Superintendent D.P.W.

C. A. Viswanathaiah

Superintendent D.P.W.
5.2.97

C.A.'s endorsement thereon.

No 893 S
20-12-96

To C. R. Viswanatha Iyer

His explanation regarding explosives missing.

With

With reference to the statement that
explosives were issued to Eachandi Asari.
If this is correct, the issue ought to have been
shown in his accounts, as they have not been, he
must himself account for them.

The same argument holds good regarding
the said mistake in the S.D.O. Office. It is his
own carelessness if he has allowed materials
not issued to him to be shown in his accounts
instead of those of the person to whom they
were issued and he must take the consequences.

Sd/- J. W. S. Smyth
Executive Engineer
Special Duty

19/12/96

/ True Copy /

C. A. Viswanathaiah

Superintendent D.P.W.
5.2.97

No 5

Madras

Dated 5 February 1897
Despatched 6th Dec

To

The Chief Engineer and Secretary
to P. W. D. Madras.

Thro,

The Executive Engineer, Special duty
Periar works. Madras

Most Honoured Sir,

I respectfully beg to lay before
your honour the following facts in hopes justice
may be administered at an early date.

1. I addressed a letter to the Executive
Engineer on 9-12-96 requesting him to order for
the disbursement of my travelling allowance for
June, pay and allowances from July 96. The
Executive Engineer in his No. 8628. ^{14.12.96} states that
he has held my pay as a part security for the
missing stores and the amount claimed by a certain
piece-worker Ramachandrier. I am surprised to
see why my pay should be withheld to answer for
that amount whilst this man did not do even a
pie worth of work under me. As regards missing
stores, I have explained in my letter dated 12.12.96.
The Executive Engineer further states that he
is not prepared to recommend even my subsistence
allowances which I am entitled to get under the
rules.

P.W. 6.2
14/3/97

rules of Civil Service Regulations.

2. For all particulars tools and plants, Explosives etc, a correct account has been maintained in my Office to show the transaction in detail. These and other records, have all along been in the custody of the Clerk M. Subramaniam, formerly a clerk under me, but now employed as a clerk in Special Executive Engineer's Office and about whom I have already reported: vide my explanation dated 31-10-96.

3. If it be as stated in Executive Engineer's No 893 S. dated 20-12-96 that such a detailed account kept up in my Office with all vouchers etc complete showing the above transaction was not forthcoming from amongst the records, it is only that Clerk should account for them.

4. This Clerk after experiencing some personal grievance or other for his conduct, contrived by all his intrigues ~~courses~~ to get the good opinion and favour of the Executive Engineer; and he, in this attempt, so far succeeded in prejudicing the Executive Engineer's mind against me by his having recourse to send up to him - petitions both pseudonymous and anonymous, containing several false allegations.

5. For all his daring villainous acts, the said Clerk hath received several encouragements from the Executive Engineer, a few of

of which I beg to note as follows: —

(a) when I reported in my letter to the Sub Division Officer No. 244 dated 16th July 96 about his (clerk's) conduct, the Executive Engineer has remarked in his endorsement dated 11 August 96 on the said letter, that it was certainly impossible that a young man just joined should go on as I reported.

(b) This clerk was suspended by Mr. Joyce in the middle of July on my report. The suspension order was not communicated to the clerk after the Executive Engineer took charge from Mr. Joyce; and the period during which the clerk was absent without leave, and for which he was suspended, was treated as one of casual leave and on duty by the Executive Engineer on 10th August - in requital of the services rendered by him (the clerk) in the concoction of cases against me - next magnified as charges.

(c) The fact that the clerk has been so far encouraged as to concoct cases against me is plainly deducible from the Executive Engineer's following endorsement and office note on Sub-Division Officer Subramaniam's letter dated 8 August 96

“Writer
Do not send these measurement Books to Mr. Flaney yet.”

I want all the measurement Books connected with the 10th Branch Channel or 11th Reach and Clerk Subramaniam must go through them with the rough measurement Books and see what can be made of them.

I presume they would have been sent to me anonymously for no reason. Send also the note Books and rough measurement Books if any amongst the records.

[Initialed] T. W. S. S.

6. After receiving so many encouragements at the Executive Engineer's hands, it is no wonder that this clerk, who in collusion with Easchandi Asary and others, fabricated the so-called Extortion and Bribery cases by their false misrepresentations, might have ^{either} secreted or destroyed such documents (regarding the Explosives) with an intent to benefit Easchandi Asary, in whom he (the clerk) is, as in duty bound, to be so much interested for their complicity.

7. It will not be out of place to mention here some of the circumstances which may show that the Special Executive Engineer is prejudiced against me from the very beginning:—

(a) The off-hand manner in which I was suspended by the Special Executive Engineer on the 25th of July, merely believing in the words of my enemies, the discontented and unscrupulous Subordinates and Contractors, and without asking my explanations.

(b) The said Suspension order was based amongst other general charges on ("knowingly making a false report about Vellari Tank"). This definite charge is not to be found in the list of charges I was asked to explain on the 10th of September. The Vellari Tank affair was disposed of unfavourably to the petitioner T. M. Sundram Pillai by the Special Executive Engineer himself long before I was suspended i.e. on the 4th of July. The above petitioner T. M. Sundram Pillai, was instrumental in bringing against the Vellari Tank affair mentioned in the Suspension order dated 25th July.

(c) In regard to the various Criminal and

and Departmental Charges, there were no complaints by any one on or before the date of Suspension.

(d) The Special Executive Engineer without any basis except the oral misrepresentations of the Clerk M. Subramaniam and others, entered my house on the 25th of July, forcibly took away all my records and other private papers and things without asking me to deliver the office papers to him. This I have represented to the Superintending Engineer VII Circle in my letters dated 3rd and 6th August, and also in person.

(e) Chevisky Venasawmy Naidu who was dismissed as follows on the 2nd of July by the Special Executive Engineer himself:—

"Tirunadoot offtake 2.7.96. The tail drop was being built without mortar inside. The masonry admitted, having received written orders from the Engineer not to commence work pending his inspection and was dismissed on the spot. He appears to be the real Contractor." and partly on whose misrepresentations some of the charges were framed, was reinstated in the said post of masonry recently for the Singular Services rendered by him.

(f) My previous Service, the testimonials which my Superior were good enough to give me the repeated promotions from Rs 80 to Rs 100 in the Temporary Establishment within a period of 7 years, and further recommendations for promotion prior to the date of Suspension; and the fact that the Special Executive Engineer only a few days after taking charge from Mr. Joyce had thought it

it fit to suspend me without showing even the slightest courtesy due to my position and without asking my explanation.

(g) The above misrepresentations have been made by my enemies to the Special Executive Engineer about the month of July after they began to entertain some personal grievance or other, and when they in consequence wanted to get the good opinion of the Executive Engineer:—

8. Under the circumstances stated above, I humbly pray your honour to consider how equitable and loyal is his endorsement No. 893-B on my letter dated 12-12-96, copies of which I beg to enclose herein for your kind perusal.

9. The above would give your honour an insight how these cases were out of malice got up, and were next magnified as charges.

10. The fact that these fictitious complaints were not preferred to during the periods when other Executive Engineers had also held the charge of Periar works and even on those occasions when lots of masonry and Earthworks were in such glaring state of progress with the expenditures ranging from 12 to 15 thousand Rupees a month, the fact that Madurai is a place generally notorious for such complaints, and that these discontented Pieceworkers were not able to profit more than they were entitled to by my strict control over their work, but if it so happened that by their malicious designs

designs, I should be removed from that charge and another be forced to it, they could then aspire to such wrongful gains, and the fact that if I, as a corrupt man, had yielded to such of their persuasions defrauding Government, there would be no room for such complaints. All these, I pray your honour would take into your kind consideration and administer justice.

11. I submitted my explanation to the Executive Engineer as regards these charges on 31st October 96. I sincerely trust that this explanation would show my innocence and reestablish my character in spite of several misrepresentations.

12. Though I am innocent, I was unjustly accused of these offences and have been on no account kept on under suspension for over six months. I humbly beg your honour to consider that this is the fair retribution for the hard work rendered on the Project? 11/10/96

13. On 21-12-96, I submitted my letter No. 2 regarding my pay and allowances addressed to the Superintending Engineer VI Circle, through the Special Executive Engineer Periar works. Though more than a month had elapsed, since that letter was submitted, I am sorry to state that I was not favoured with any reply yet.

14. If I am not allowed to draw the usual Subsistence allowance authorized by Government

I beg your honour to consider how am I to maintain myself, my family, pony etc for the past six months in a strange place and in such strained circumstances as I am now destined to be.

15. In conclusion, I humbly beg your honour would take my miserable circumstances into your kind consideration, and order for the early disbursement of my pay and allowances that I may not suffer any longer thereby.

I beg to remain
Honoured Sir

Your most obedt Servant

P. R. Narayanaiah

Supervisor D.P.W.

/ True Copy/

708

Submitted to the Chief Engineer and Secretary to P.W.D.
for his kind perusal and justice

P. R. Narayanaiah
Supervisor D.P.W.
6.2.97

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 1867

Order

From The Examiner
P.W. Accounts
Madras

No. 5652/A

Dated 18th February 1897

Received 19.2.97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Chumambur. off. taken
in the Periyar Sub. D.
Shaking with remittance
the sanction up to
Jan'y/97 and expending
up to date on —

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

KEEP-WITH

CURRENT No.

GOVT.
OF MADRAS. }

1896.

E. No. 27.

1,000-9-12-95.

{ P. W.
{ DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS,

dated

189 .

Madras, 18th February

1896.

OFFICE NOTE No. 565 of A

Register Estimate Outlay.
Per. Ro.

To W.

Ridge at 2 m. 4 for 620 ft
in the Lehmannburg off
Lake _____

N^o 3 fall at 2 m. 4 f

620 ft in do

N^o 1 fall at 500 ft in

-do- do-

Net^o 2 fall at 4 m. 460

in-do-do-

2) No. 4 fall at 3 m. 1 ft

"600' in-do-do

1. No 5 fall at 4 m. 2 ft.

60 ft in-do-do-

1. No 6 fall at 6 m 2 fur

0 ft in-do-do-

1. No. 7 11 at 60 30

fall at 6 m. 3 ft

240 ft in-do-d

at 5 fall at 5 m, fu

440 ft in - do - do

Head Office to

Chunambur off

Box 10

same for all branches

Channel _____

Total. . 5070 2026-5-11

Your O.N.No.544 C.dated 27th.January/
1897.

In connection with the works

"Chunambur off take", the marginally noted estimates aggregating Rs. 5070 have been sanctioned up to January 1897 and the expenditure incurred on them up to date amounts to Rs. 2026-5-II; no bills for expenditure sent to this office have been passed by Supervisor C. R. Visvanatha Aiyar.

C.

18/2