Public Works (1897) Department.

G.O., No. 943 W

DATED 2 April 1897

[Despatch Abstract.]

C. M. Mylappa Pillai, Clerk, West Coast Dn.—

Declining to interfere in favour of — in the matter of the stoppage of an increment of his pay and his transfer from the North Arcot to the West Coast Dn at his own expense, ordered by the S.E. and upheld by the ~~S.E.~~ Chief Engineer,

[P.W. 26. / 5,000—60-11-96.]

3-4-97

Indexed. 3/4/97

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

B Forward orders

No. 943 W of 2-4-97

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

From the S.E. IV Circle No. 614 W of 10-12-96.
" " Exr. P.W. accts No. 22 A of 14.1.97.

The petitioner will be informed that the Govt. declines to interfere in his favour.

Cu

21/3/97

S.E. IV Circle
with 9 enclos
Exr. P.W.A.

D 5/4/97

[P. W. 40.
300—13-3-97.]

HE

Appeal from a clerk in the West Coast Dn. office

P. W. D.

Current Nos. 11352 of 1896 & 483 of 1897

For orders.

The petition, flagged A, is an appeal from C. M. Mylappa Pillai, Clerk in the office of the Ex. Engr. West Coast division, and formerly of the North Arcot division, against P.W. memo. No 3486e dated 1 Octr. 1896 (flagged B) in which the Chief Engr. declined to override certain orders of the Supdg. Engr. V Circle, under which the petitioner was deprived of an increment of pay for one year, and transferred from the North Arcot to the West Coast division at his own expense.

When the petitioner appealed to the Chief Engr. in July 1896, the complete file of papers on the subject was obtained from the

~~C.A.W.~~
S.A.W.

Ex. Engr's office, & the following facts were elicited from it. The papers were returned to the Supdg. Engr. with the memo. of 1st Octr. last, & they will called for again, if desired.

In May 1893, the petitioner was fined one Rupee, on the report of Mr Lacy, Asst. Engr., then temporarily in charge of the North Arcot division, for refusing to do certain work which the Accountant had ordered him to do.

In June 1893, after Mr A. E. Clerk, Ex. Engr., had joined the division, the petr. appealed for a remission of the fine, but Mr Clerk declined to interfere as the matter had been dealt with by the Supdg. Engr.

In March 1895 he appealed to the Supdg. Engr. against the fine, complaining at the same time of the personal enmity & ill treatment of the Accountant. On this appeal, Mr Clerk wrote a draft letter to the Supdg. Engr., reporting in very unfavourable terms on the character of the petitioner. The latter then begged that his petition, & the Ex. Engr's forwarding letter might be withheld. This was acceded to, but Mr Clerk ordered that the petn. & his draft should be kept on record in the divisional office. A few days later, in March 1895, the petitioner was reported by the Accountant to the Ex. Engr. for failing to make certain entries in the monthly accounts. The petitioner's written explanation was taken, but Mr Clerk declined to accept his excuses, & for this and "various shortcomings," his annual increment of pay which fell due in February 1895, was stopped. The petitioner was in the Rs 30-2-40 grade, & had drawn his first increment in February 1894 - He was thus drawing Rs 32 per mensem, & the further increase of Rs 2, which accrued in February 1895 was disallowed.

In Sept. 1895, the petitioner appealed to the Supdg Engr against the stoppage of his increment. By this time, the previous accountant, M. Govindarajulu Nayudu, had been removed from the division, and Mr W. J. Jackson had become divisional accountant. The latter reported unfavourably on the petitioner in submitting the appeal, & Mr Clark sent on the appeal, with the previous petition of March 1895 & the recent draft letter thereon, remarking that the petr was insubordinate & useless. The Supdg Engr thereupon ordered the clerk to be transferred to the West Coast division at his own expense.

In October 1895, before leaving Vellore, Mylappa Pillai once more appealed to the Supdg Engr, begging that his 2nd increment, due in July 1895, might be granted with arrears, stating that early in the year he had at once completed the accounts work for which his increment had been stopped. In sending this on Mr Clark remarked that the petitioner's statement was correct as regards completing his work, but that he could add nothing more in his favour. The Supdg Engr's order on this petition was that the petr was not to get any increment until he had put in 6 months' service in his new division, & until he was favourably reported on.

In November 1895, Mylappa Pillai petitioned for his travelling expenses to Calicut, but the Supdg Engr rejected his request.

He again appealed in January & Feby 1896; the last petition was favourably endorsed by the Ex. Engr West Coast Dn, who stated that the petr had been working satisfactorily in the accounts branch since his transfer to the division

The Supdg. Engr's endorsement on this was that the order already issued must stand.

In May 1896, the petitioner represented that his 6 months probation in the West Coast divn had expired on 6.5.96, & begged that his increment might be granted from February 1895. This petition also was favorably endorsed by the Ex. Engr, & Mr Larminie, who was then temporarily in charge of the Circle, during Mr Hannan's absence on privilege leave, sanctioned the increment, "but not with arrears". The petitioner's service book shows that the increment was actually granted from 1st Feby 1896, so that he did get arrears for a few months in 1896, but the arrears for the year ending 31-1-96 were disallowed.

In June 1896, the petitioner submitted a "review petition" to the Supdg Engr, reiterating all the circumstances of his case, & begging for his travelling expenses from Vellore to Calicut & for arrears of increment. Mr Larminie's order thereon was that he could not interfere.

He then appealed to the Chief Engr in July 1896, & the result was the memo of 1st Octr 1896, No. 3486C (flagged B).

The petitioner, in his present appeal to Govt., having made certain allegations against Mr. Jackson, the Accountant, the latter was called on for a reply. His explanation is the document flagged C. The petitioner appears to have been most ~~[illegible]~~ troublesome & insubordinate to both accountants, & obstructive in the execution of work. His transfer to another division was therefore rightly ordered by the Supdg Engr, & as the transfer was not in the interests of the public service, his travelling expenses were correctly disallowed. Increments of pay are given for approved service, & as the clerk did not render approved service during the year ending 31-1-95, his increment on 1-2-95 was rightly disallowed.

The Chief Engr therefore considers himself justified in upholding the action of the Supdg Engineer.

25/1/97

W

The Chief Engineer is, in my opinion, right & I decline to interfere.

A.SH

30.3.97

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 483

Order

From The Examiner
P.W. Accounts
Madras

No 22A

Dated 14th January 1897

Received 15.1.97

Enclosures ~~13~~ 15

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

C. M. Mylappa Pillai Clerk Ex. Engineer's Office West Coast Dn. Forwards appeal from ——— with remarks & Mr. Jackson's reply to the statements in paras 3 & 4.

R. 31-3-97

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
memo	3486 C	P. W.	1-10-96 ✓
"	2993 C	"	3-8-96 ✓
"	2905 C	"	7-10-95 ✓
G.O.	1692 W	"	10-7-95 ✓
"	1548 W	"	26-6-95 ✓
"	~~1135 W~~	"	~~13-5-85~~
memo	1762 C	"	7-5-95 ✓
G.O.	518 W	"	6-3-95 ✓
memo	413 C	"	4-2-95 ✓
G.O.	169 W	"	23-1-95 ✓
"	1135 W	"	13-5-85 ✓
"	953 W A	"	22-4-85 ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Duplicate

CHIEF SECRETARY
-3 DEC 1896
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
FORT ST GEORGE,
MADRAS.

The humble Appeal of C. M. Mylappa Pillai,
Clerk, Executive Engineer's Office, West Coast
Division, Calicut.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

x A

That Memorialist humbly appeals against the Memorandum No. 3486 C, dated 1st October 1896, of the Chief Engineer P. W. D. (copy enclosed). That with respect to para 1 of the Memorandum, Memorialist humbly submits that the Chief Engineer has ignored the material circumstance that the alleged bad report preferred by the Accountant against him was never considered or enquired into by the Executive Engineer of North Arcot Division who merely recommended Memorialist's removal from the Division by an endorsement on an appeal to the Superintending Engineer (384 of 6th October 1895) against a similar piece of injustice done to Memorialist by the former Accountant Mr. Govindu Rajulu Naidu. The Superintending Engineer, ignoring the facts and arguments adduced in the appeal, passed a severe order transferring Memorialist at his own expense from North Arcot to the West Coast Division. In the first place, the Executive Engineer having had no personal supervision whatever over Memorialist was guided merely by the representation of his Accountants. In his endorsement No. 641 S. E., dated 7th February 1896, the Executive Engineer wrote:—"Mr. Jackson my present Accountant, found him (Memorialist) a most incompetent Assistant." It is clear then that the Executive Engineer did not personally acquaint himself with the truth or otherwise of the allegation of the Accountant. A certain charge of a serious nature had been prefered against Memorialist, in bare justice to whom that charge should have been exhaustively enquired into and his defence demanded. The nature of the charge was such that an enquiry was perfectly feasible, and as the future prospects of the accused as well as the interests of the Department were concerned, it behoved the superiors to do all that was needed to ascertain whether the charge was established before punishment could be recommended or meted out. Unhappily, the Executive Engineer did not grant Memorialist the privilege he was entitled to in this respect, and the Superintending Engineer trusting to the vague and unspecific statement of the Accountant, passed another order withholding also Memorialist's increment for a further period of 6 months.

2 That para 3 of Memorialist's review petition to the Superintending Engineer will shew that strained relations existed between Accountant, Mr. Jackson, and Memorialist.

3 Immediately after the former joined North Arcot Division, he sent word through his relief that he, being in receipt of a salary of Rs. 200, expected more assistance than his predecessors from the Clerks under his orders and Memorialist was required in addition to his other duties, to take charge of the Division Cash Book and the

Cash Chest. Memorialist expressed his inability and pointed out the statement shewing the re-distribution of work in the Account Section prepared by the previous Accountant and approved by the Executive Engineer under instructions of the Superintending Engineer. After 3 or 4 days, Mr. Jackson asked Memorialist to maintain the Register of Grants in addition to his other work which was already heavy when compared with what was being turned out by the Account Clerks in other Divisions in the Circle. Memorialist's refusal to comply with the request of Mr. Jackson made the latter his illwisher, and the Accountant thereafter treated him very hard and even indulged in the habit of addressing Memorialist as "chap," "fool," etc. The illwill was only intensified when Memorialist appealed to the Superintending Engineer against Mr. Jackson's predecessor.

4 That from the above circumstances it is clear that Mr. Jackson had, or thought he had, reason to be dissatisfied with Memorialist and he gave vent to his dissatisfaction in the report above quoted. Since Memorialist had plainly narrated to two of his superiors his version of the origin of such dissatisfaction and since he had shewn that more than his legitimate share of work was intended to be thrust on him, it became necessary that the *ipse dixit* of the Accountant should not have been unconditionally accepted by the Executive Engineer as was done.

5 That coming to para 2 of the Memorandum under appeal, in which reference is made (1) to his failure to make certain entries in the monthly accounts and (2) to insubordination and inefficiency in the folowing September, Memorialist deferentially submits that he is still unaware of any sin of omission on his part regarding the entries. The records are there and reference to the office copies of all the schedules he prepared until March 1895 will establish his innocence. One solitary omission was noticed by the Examiner at his inspection in December 1894. The names of contractors who had dues to receive were not noted in the Register of Works. No doubt, it was an omission, but, at the same time, it was not a fault, for the practice whereby such names were not entered obtained from a long time before Memorialist joined the Division. This omission had never been noticed either by the Accountant or by the Executive Engineer both of whom deal monthly with the Register of Works for check and examination. It was Memorialist who had brought up these Registers to the date of his transfer and had them verified by Mr. Jackson in order to obtain the second increment promised by the Executive Engineer. (Vide his endorsement No. 641 S. E. of 7th February 1896 above referred to). In that endorsement the Engineer wrote:—"Mr. Jackson says that his (Memorialist's) statement that he did what he said he did is correct." That Memorialist humbly regrets that the above endorsement was ignored by the Superintending Engineer in ordering stoppage of the increment for a further period of 6 months, though the Executive Engineer's original stoppage order was only because the names of unsettled contractors were not noted in the Registers as pointed out by the Examiner. The moral validity of that original order itself is not apparent in the light thrown upon the practice obtaining in that or any other Division in the Circle. Moreover, that practice was by no means antagonistic to the Code. A regular ledger is maintained to show the dues of contractors, and an extract from this ledger is submitted monthly for the Examiner's audit. Now, Memorialist humbly submits that his omision to enter the names of unsettled contractors in the Registers was no infringement whatever of procedure or routine and, in the 2nd place, when the Executive Engineer, ordered the names to be entered, Memorialist promptly obeyed the order and reported the same to the Executive Engineer on the 3rd of April 1895. And yet, this was the very date on which the Executive Engineer. issued the original order withholding Memorialist's increment. That as regards the charge of insubordination, Memorialist humbly draws attention again to the statements regarding Mr. Jackson referred to above as having found a place in his Review Petition addressed to the Superintending Engineer. If Memorialist's reasonable attitude towards Mr. Jackson can be construed as insubordination, then Memorialist can only regret his ill-luck. But Memorialist would respectfully point out in this connection that Mr. Jackson had intentionally dishonored a statement made by his predecessor and approved by the Executive Engineer under instruction from the Superintending Engineer (Vide the latter officer's No. 260 of 26th May 1893) and Mr. Jackson even detained Memorialist for two days after relief on transfer without paying either his salary or the advance that had already been sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer.

6 That Memorialist feels that in justice to himself he must refer to another important fact. In charging Memorialist with omission to enter names of unsettled contractors, the Accountant Mr. Govindu Rajulu Naidu also charged him with omission to enter an item of 7 pies in the Work Abstract. Memorialist protested against that charge too and proved that the charge was altogether baseless and should never have been brought The charge was then abandoned—additional reason why the other charge brought by Mr. Naidu should not have been so readily credited and why Memorialist should have been allowed a full opportunity to explain.

× A

7 × That as regards the charge of inefficiency, Memorialist humbly refers to the detailed list which he encloses of his services as also to his Service Register, from which it will be seen that several Superintending and long standing Executive Engineers down to the time of Mr. Clerk have certified in his favour. Against this what can be the biassed representations of an Accountant who had barely two months experience of Memorialist? Is it not significant that no other Accountants, though they had considerably longer experience of him, ever found him wanting either in efficiency or in a sense of discipline and subordination? Is it not significant also that while Memorialist bore an excellent character for over 21 years in various offices, he should so suddenly have degenerated on being removed to North Arcot in 1893? Memorialist also humbly refers to the enclosed copy of an endorsement of the late Manager of the Circle Office with the orders of the Superintending Engineer thereon. That endorsement also bears testimony to Memorialist's efficiency and the fact remains that in para 3 of the Memorandum now under appeal, the Chief Engineer admits that Petitioner has worked satisfactorily since his transfer to the West Coast Division in November 1895. That thus it is clear that all through his career Memorialist bore an excellent character and was never reproached until he served under Mr. Jackson. Taking the fact of Memorialist's previous and subsequent good character along with his experiences under Mr. Jackson, he respectfully begs of Your Excellency to draw the rational inference.

× B C & C

× D

8 Memorialist humbly begs Your Excellency in Council to consider his hard case and sanction the travelling allowance from Vellore to Calicut which was denied him and the one year's increment which was disallowed on the unsupported and unwarranted representation of the Accountant. Memorialist has already sacrificed three years service

towards the increment in his present grade purely owing to the temporary nature of the appointment in the late Barur Project Division (Vide enclosure.) For the act of gracious justice he seeks Your Excellency's humble Memorialist shall, as in duty bound, E

Ever Pray.

(Sd) C. M. Mylappan

Clerk, Executive Engineer's Office,
West Coast Division, Calicut.

Calicut
24-th November 1896.

ENCLOSURES.

- A, Copy of the Chief Engineer's Order under Appeal.
- B. Detailed List of services and recommendations of several officers for promotion &c.
- C. Extract from letter from S. E. IV to late S. E. III.
- D. Endorsement of the Manager with S. E's order thereon.
- E. Examiner's endorsement regarding temporary service.
- F. Work abstrct for February 1895. } To be kindly put up in office
- G. Service Register. }

(True Copy)

C. M. Mylappan Clerk
Executive Engineer's office
West Coast Dn

Calicut
30th Nov 1896

P. W. E. 11 [illegible]
H352/96
4/3/97

C

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL,
FORT ST GEORGE,
MADRAS.

The humble Appeal of C. M. Mylappa Pillai,
Clerk, Executive Engineer's Office, West Coast
Division, Calicut.

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

A That Memorialist humbly appeals against the Memorandum No. 3486 C, dated 1st October 1896, of the Chief Engineer P. W. D. (copy enclosed). That with respect to para 1 of the Memorandum, Memorialist humbly submits that the Chief Enginer has ignored the material circumstance that the alleged bad report preferred by the Accountant against him was never considered or enquired into by the Executive Engineer of North Arcot Division who merely recommended Memorialist's removal from the Division by an endorsement on an appeal to the Superintending Engineer (384 of 6th October 1895) against a similar piece of injustice done to Memorialist by the former Accountant Mr. Govindu Rajulu Naidu. The Superintending Engineer, ignoring the facts and arguments adduced in the appeal, passed a severe order transferring Memorialist at his own expense from North Arcot to the West Coast Division. In the first place, the Executive Engineer having had no personal supervision whatever over Memorialist was guided merely by the representation of his Accountants. In his endorsement No. 641 S. E., dated 7th February 1896, the Executive Engineer wrote:—"Mr. Jackson my present Accountant, found him (Memorialist) a most incompetent Assistant." It is clear then that the Executive Engineer did not personally acquaint himself with the truth or otherwise of the allegation of the Accountant. A certain charge of a serious nature had been preferred against Memorialist, in bare justice to whom that charge should have been exhaustively enquired into and his defence demanded. The nature of the charge was such that an enquiry was perfectly feasible, and as the future prospects of the accused as well as the interests of the Department were concerned, it behoved the superiors to do all that was needed to ascertain whether the charge was established before punishment could be recommended or meted out. Unhappily, the Executive Engineer did not grant Memorialist the privilege he was entitled to in this respect, and the Superintending Engineer trusting to the vague and unspecific statement of the Accountant, passed another order withholding also Memorialist's increment for a further period of 6 months.

2. That para 3 of Memorialist's review Petition to the Superintending Engineer will shew that strained relations existed between Accountant, Mr. Jackson, and Memorialist.

3. Immediately after the former joined North Arcot Division, he sent word through his relief that he, being in receipt of a salary of Rs. 200, expected more assistance than his predecessors from the Clerks under his orders and Memorialist was required in addition to his other duties, to take charge of the Division Cash Book and the

Cash Chest. Memorialist expressed his inability and pointed out the statement shewing the re-distribution of work in the Account Section prepared by the previous Accountant and approved by the Executive Engineer under instructions of the Superintending Engineer. After 3 or 4 days, Mr. Jackson asked Memorialist to maintain the Register of Grants in addition to his other work which was already heavy when compared with what was being turned out by the Account Clerks in other Divisions in the Circle. Memorialist's refusal to comply with the request of Mr. Jackson made the latter his illwisher, and the Accountant thereafter treated him very hard and even indulged in the habit of addressing Memorialist as "chap," "fool," etc. The illwill was only intensified when Memorialist appealed to the Superintending Engineer against Mr. Jackson's predecessor.

4. That from the above circumstances it is clear that Mr. Jackson had, or thought he had, reason to be dissatisfied with Memorialist and he gave vent to his dissatisfaction in the report above quoted. Since Memorialist had plainly narrated to two of his superiors his version of the origin of such dissatisfaction and since he had shewn that more than his legitimate share of work was intended to be thrust on him, it became necessary that the *ipse dixit* of the Accountant should not have been unconditionally accepted by the Executive Engineer as was done.

5 That coming to para 2 of the Memorandum under appeal, in which reference is made (1) to his failure to make certain entries in the monthly accounts and (2) to insubordination and inefficiency in the following September, Memorialist deferentially submits that he is still unaware of any sin of omission on his part regarding the entries. The records are there and reference to the office copies of all the schedules he prepared until March 1895 will establish his innocence. One solitary omission was noticed by the Examiner at his inspection in December 1894. The names of contractors who had dues to receive were not noted in the Register of Works. No doubt, it was an omission, but, at the same time, it was not a fault, for the practice whereby such names were not entered obtained from a long time before Memorialist joined the Division. This omission had never been noticed either by the Accountant or by the Executive Engineer both of whom deal monthly with the Register of Works for check and examination. It was Memorialist who had brought up these Registers to the date of his transfer and had them verified by Mr. Jackson in order to obtain the second increment promised by the Executive Engineer. (Vide his endorsement No. 641 S. E. of 7th February 1896 above referred to). In that endorsement the Engineer wrote:—"Mr. Jackson says that his (Memorialist's) statement that he did what he said he did is correct." That Memorialist humbly regrets that the above endorsement was ignored by the Superintending Engineer in ordering stoppage of the increment for a further period of 6 months, though the Executive Engineer's original stoppage order was only because the names of unsettled contractors were not noted in the Registers as pointed out by the Examiner. The moral validity of that original order itself is not apparent in the light thrown upon the practice obtaining in that or any other Division in the Circle. Moreover, that practice was by no means antagonistic to the Code. A regular ledger is maintained to show the dues of contractors, and an extract from this ledger is submitted monthly for the Examiner's audit. Now, Memorialist humbly submits that his omission to enter the names of unsettled contractors in the Registers was no infringement whatever of procedure or routine and, in the 2nd place, when the Executive Engineer, ordered the names to be entered, Memorialist promptly obeyed the order and reported the same to the Executive Engineer on the 3rd of April 1895. And yet, this was the very date on which the Executive Engineer. issued the original order withholding Memorialist's increment. That as regards the charge of insubordination, Memorialist humbly draws attention again to the statements regarding Mr. Jackson referred to above as having found a place in his Review Petition addressed to the Superintending Engineer. If Memorialist's reasonable attitude towards Mr. Jackson can be construed as insubordination, then Memorialist can only regret his ill-luck. But Memorialist would respectfully point out in this connection that Mr. Jackson had intentionally dishonored a statement made by his predecessor and approved by the Executive Engineer under instruction from the Superintending Engineer (Vide the latter officer's No. 260 of 26th May 1893) and Mr. Jackson even detained Memorialist for two days after relief on transfer without paying either his salary or the advance that had already been sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer.

C

⊗ F 6. That Memorialist feels that in justice to himself he must refer to another important fact. In charging Memorialist with omission to enter names of unsettled contractors, the Accountant Mr. Govindu Rajulu Naidu also charged him with omission to enter an item of 7 pies in the Work Abstract. Memorialist protested against that charge too and proved that the charge was altogether baseless and should never have been brought The charge was then abandoned—additional reason why the other charge brought by Mr. Naidu should not have been so readily credited and why Memorialist should have been allowed a full opportunity to explain.

× B, C× G ×7. That as regards the charge of inefficiency, Memorialist humbly refers to the detailed list which he encloses of his services as also to his Service Register, from which it will be seen that several Superintending and long standing Executive Engineers down to the time of Mr. Clerk have certified in his favour. Against this what can be the biassed representations of an Accountant who had barely two months experience of Memorialist? Is it not significant that no other Accountants, though they had considerably longer experience of him, ever found him wanting either in efficiency or in a sense of discipline and subordination? Is it not significant also that while Memorialist bore an excellent character for over 21 years in various offices, he should so suddenly have degenerated on being removed to North Arcot in 1893? Memorialist also humbly refers to the enclosed copy of an endorsement of the late Manager of the Circle Office with the orders of the Superintending Engineer thereon. That endorsement also bears testimony to Memorialist's efficiency and the fact remains that in para 3 of the Memorandum now under appeal, the Chief Engineer admits that Petitioner has worked satisfactorily since his transfer to the West Coast Division in November 1895. That thus it is clear that all through his career Memorialist bore an excellent character and was never reproached until he served under Mr. Jackson. Taking the fact of Memorialist's previous and subsequent good character along with his experiences under Mr. Jackson, he respectfully begs of Your Excellency to draw the rational inference. ×D

8. Memorialist humbly begs Your Excellency in Council to consider his hard case and sanction the travelling allowance from Vellore to Calicut which was denied him and the one year's increment which was disallowed on the unsupported and unwarranted representation of the Accountant. Memorialist has already sacrificed three years service

towards the increment in his present grade purely owing to the temporary nature of the appointment in the late Barur Project Division (Vide enclosure.) For the act of gracious justice he seeks Your Excellency's humble Memorialist shall, as in duty bound,

Ever Pray.

Clerk, Executive Engineer's Office,
West Coast Division, Calicut.

Calicut
24th ~~th~~ November 1896.

ENCLOSURES.

- A, Copy of the Chief Engineer's Order under Appeal.
- B. Detailed List of services and recommendations of several officers for promotion &c.
- C. Extract from letter from S. E. IV to late S. E. III.
- D. Endorsement of the Manager with S. E's order thereon.
- E. Examiner's endorsement regarding temporary service.
- F. Work abstrct for February 1895.
- G. Service Register.

} To be kindly returned in office

Enclosure F is in the office of the Executive Engineer, North Arcot Division

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE W.W.D.
No. 847/W
7-DEC.96
ENCL'D:
FOURTH CIRCLE.

P.W. E. 11 in duple:
H352/96
483/97

No 734 S.E.

Executive Engineer's Office,
WEST COAST DIVISION.
CALICUT, 2d ~~November~~ December 1896

FROM

C. W. Wood Esq
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
WEST COAST DIVISION,

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
FOURTH CIRCLE,
COIMBATORE,

ENCLOSURE.
1. Service book
1 Petition with
5 Enclosures
2

Sir,

I have the honour to forward a Memorial to His Excellency the Governor from clerk Mylappa Pillay appealing against Chief Engineer's G. O. No. 3486 C dated 1st October/96.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt Servant.

C. W. Wood
Executive Engineer

No 614/W d/ 10-12-96

Forwarded thro' the Chief Engineer, PWD.

J Hanman

Supg. Engineer, 4 Circle

Enclos: 11. d.t.

P. W. D.

WEST COAST DIVISION.

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFF. P.W.D.
No. ~~847 W.C.~~
7-DEC.96
1-7
FOURTH CIRCLE.

FROM

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
WEST COAST DIVISION,

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
FOURTH CIRCLE,
COIMBATORE.

Dated 2nd
Despatched 3rd } December 1896.

No. 734 S.E.

ENCLOSURE. 2

SUBJECT.

C. M. Mylappa Pillay
Clerk.

Submits appeal memorial of ——

P.W. E.12 / 483/97

Witten

Public Works (1896) Department.

E.13

CURRENT No. ~~4352~~
483/97

No. 4954C of 18. Decr 1896.

Order O. u.

To C

Before this petition is submitted to Govt. for orders, please obtain Mr. Accountant Jackson's reply to the statements made by the petitioner in paras 3 & 4, & in the last sentence of para 5. Please also favour me with your opinion on the petitioner's assertion in para 5 that the omission to enter in the register of works the names of contractors to whom sums were due, was "by no means antagonistic to the Code" and "no infringement whatever of procedure or routine".

17/12/96
W

Cn

From The Supg. Engineer, 4th Circle

No. 614/W. 3486C 1.10.96

Dated 10th December 1896.

Received 14. 12. 96

Enclosures 11.* (*one (Encl. 11) in duplicate)

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

C. M. Mylappa Pillai Clerk, Ex: Engr's office, West Coast Division.

- Forwards appeal petition from —

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

No 4430 Dd 21/12/96

No. 1067
21 DEC 96

Office note No. 4954 C. dated 18th.
December 1896.

Forwarded to the Executive Engineer Buckingham Canal Division with a request that he will obtain Mr. Jackson's reply to the statements referred and send it to undersigned, at the same time returning the file of papers.

D. C. Gordon
Examiner, P. W. Accounts, Madras.

A. I. M.
19/12.

To Mr Jackson for the
reply required
21/12 96.

Madras
6. January 97.

EXAMINED,
P. W. ACCOUNTS
14 JAN. 1897
No.............

To

The Examiner
P.W. Accounts
Madras
~~(Through the Ex. Engineer, Buckingham [illegible])~~

Sir,

With reference to your endorsement No 4430 dated 19th December 96 on the appeal of Clerk C.M. Mylappa Pillay, I beg to explain as follows:-

I am placed at a disadvantage by not having the records of the case to refer to and by ~~my~~ being away from the Division. I have therefore to rely on my memory, and as the appeal deals with what took place or is reported to have taken place, over a year ago, I cannot speak with as much certainty as I could wish. The petitioner lays great stress upon the circumstance that he had made some statements against me in a Review Petition to the Superintending Engineer and on the circumstance that he "had "plainly narrated to two of his superiors "his version of the origin" of my dissatisfaction with him. The Review Petition is not in the file to refer to. I would beg, however,

to

to submit that the petitioner had lots of time and opportunity to controvert my report against him when both Mr. Clerk Ex. Engineer, who knew him for a longer period than myself & who dealt with my complaint and the complaint of my predecessor against the petitioner, & I were in the Division instead of placing me at an unfair disadvantage by springing this charge upon me after I have been transferred from and lost touch with the Division. This is precisely what he did in the matter of his appeal to the Supg Engineer against my predecessor M.R.Ry M. Govindarajulu Naidu, through whose report the petitioner was not granted his increment of Rs 2 in February 95. His charge of ill will resolves itself into an inference of his own from certain transactions which he remembers against me. Immediately after I joined the Division the petitioner, for reasons of his own, assumed a most hostile attitude towards me and was exceedingly disputatious. He badgered and worried me to such an extent that I could not put up with him any longer and I consequently reported him to the Ex. Engineer Mr. Clerk the very first day that officer attended office on return to Head quarters from tour, and begged that he might be transferred.

I joined the Division on the 29. August 95 & the petitioner was transferred to the West Coast Division on the 28. October 95. Mr. Clerk has placed on record that the petitioner was the "sworn foe" of Accountant M.R.Ry M. Govindarajulu Naidu, so that it will be seen that I am not the only accountant who had unpleasant times of it with the petitioner &

Para 3 of the appeal. The petitioner endeavours to make capital of some tittle-tattle of which I have not the slightest recollection & which he himself states was communicated to him by a third party. I do not know why he should have been asked to write up the Cash book & cheques and make cash payments when it was proposed (and the proposal was put into force) that the Head Clerk, as in other Divisions, should undertake these duties, & he was very willing to do so. I would not in any seriousness have made such a request of the petitioner. Regarding the Register of grants, the petitioner's memory serves him better than mine. As the entries in this Register average not more than two or three a month (15 minutes work at the most), I would beg to submit that there could not have been much ado about

about writing this up. His version is that I made the request and that he gave me a point blank refusal & that I took umbrage at his "reasonable attitude" He dates my ill-will from this period & not apparently from the period he refused to write up the cash book. He says that my ill-will manifested itself in the use of harsh epithets of which he quotes only two. All I can say in reply is that his ill-will towards me knows no bounds. The expression "chap" is, I beg to submit, not ordinarily used to give expression to ill-will or anger. His remark that my ill-will towards him was only intensified when he appealed to the Supg Engineer against my predecessor furnishes me with a strong reason for inferring that my refusal to back him up in his appeal increased his hostility towards me.

Para 4. I was dissatisfied with the clerk as an assistant & reported him accordingly, but he very ingeniously attributes this dissatisfaction to ill-will. No more work was given to or thrust upon him by me than he had to do under my predecessor. The work in the Division was very heavy and he had his share of it; & as he found he had heavier work than in other divisions, he was discontented and was always complaining & seemed to think the Accountant was the proper person to vent his spleen upon.

Para 5. Not having the records to refer to, I do not know what statement, as alleged by the petitioner, I "intentionally dishonoured" and what bearing it has upon his charge of ill-will against me. He uses very strong language; but it is to his interest to vilify me as much as possible. It would have been more satisfactory, I beg to submit, if he had had the matter settled straight off when both he & I were in the Division. Regarding his detention for two days in Vellore after relief, I beg that the matter may be referred to the North Arcot Division for report, if considered necessary; for the charge is brought forward to prove ill-will and is incorrect so far as I am concerned. If there was any delay, the Head Clerk will be able to explain, as he had the making of payments. So far as I can remember, the delay was unavoidable. The Ex. Engineer was on tour and there was no money in the Divisional chest, & the Sub-divisional officer Vellore had to be asked by letter to issue a cheque. I speak from memory, but even granted that there was delay

delay and the delay was avoidable I fail to see why I should be blamed therefor.

I beg to remain
Sir
Your most obdt servant
W. Jackson
Accountant
Buckingham Canal Division

J No. 220 / 11-1-97

Forwarded.

11/1/97
Executive Engineer
Buckingham Canal

P.W. E. 15 / 483/97

E. No. 27.
1,000—9-12-95.

KEEP-WITH CURRENT No.

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1896.7 { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS,

dated 189 .

Madras, 14th January ~~1896~~ 1897

OFFICE NOTE No. 22 A

To

W.

Your O.N.No.4954 C.dated 18th. December 1896.

Mr. Jackson's reply to the petitioner's remarks is herewith sent.

Flagged C.

2. In regard to the petitioner's remarks regarding entry in "Registers of Works" of Contractors' names, he has misunderstood what was stated. In para 21 of the report issued with G.O.No.169 W dated 23rd.January 1895 the Examiner stated that the ~~accounts show~~ amount shown as "arrears" in the register of works could not be verified in some cases owing to the names of a number of contractors not being recorded. The record would not be in the register of works, but in the Work Abstracts from which the former is posted. Contractors names have never been entered in the register.

C.
14/1/97

4255

This portion of file can be returned to records.

Cs

13/5/37

S99