Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 2926 W

DATED 18 Nov/98

[Despatch Abstract.]

To W. S. J. Roberts, late a clerk in the P.W. Secretariat

Stating that Govt. sees no reason for modifying the orders previously passed in the case of ——

[P. W. 2 / 500—11-10-98.]

Indexed 21/11

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

B

P.W. DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Again G.O., dated 189 , No.
Current No. 8850 of 1898, dated 27th May, from Mr. S. T. Roberts
" " " 189 , " , "
" " " 189 , " , "

ORDER.

No: 2926 W 18·11·9

The Govt: sees no reas
for modifying the orders previou
passed in this case. Mr. Robert
cannot be reinstated, and
cannot be declared eligible
for re-employment in Govt:
service.

A.K.
2.11.98.

4.11.98.

[illegible]
11/11/98.

A.S.H.
15.11.98

To
The Hon'ble the Chief Secy,
for favour of counter-initials

To
Mr. S. T. Roberts 17/11/98

Re 17/11/98

[illegible] Public Dept. file + [illegible]

17.11.98

Despatched 19/11/98

DW
W.

P. W. 4.
500—24-3-98.

S. 8-11-98. H.E. 14.11.98. 17.11.98

1

Public Works Department.

C. No. 8850

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR. again on return from tour –
~~The Honourable Sir Henry Bliss K.C.I.E.~~
~~THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS, K.C.I.E.~~
~~The Honourable Mr. Arundel~~
~~THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.~~

SUBJECT.

Appeal from Mr. S. T. ROBERTS, late a clerk in the P. W. Secretariat.

FOR ORDERS.

Mr. Roberts applied on the 29th November 1886 for the benefit of the Insolvency Act, and was placed under suspension from that date. On the 25th April 1887 he was given a free discharge, and, on the recommendation of Col. Hasted. R.E., the then Secretary to Government P. W. D., he was reinstated without arrears of pay, vide G.O. No. 753 Public dated 2nd June 1887.

2. In April 1892 he again obtained the benefit of the Act, and Colonel Pennycuick R.E., then Secretary to Government P. W. D. made no recommendation on the clerk's behalf but submitted the matter for such consideration as the Government might be pleased to accord to it. The Government directed the removal of the clerk from the public service vide G.O. No. 302 Public dated 4th May 1892 and this

Mr.

I feel obliged to accept the view of this case expressed by the C.S. in his Note of 3.8.98 in C°. N°. 617 D.

A.H.
2.10.98

On further reflection, while I still hold to the above, so far as re-instatement goes, I would, as in the case of a Mahommedan Clerk who had been dismissed on account of Bankruptcy, – allow Mr. Roberts to be eligible for re-employment, but on say, on probation for a year, in a clerkship, where there is no pecuniary responsibility, and carrying a salary not exceeding Rs. 50 p.m. x

x He was getting Rs. 88 when he was dismissed.

A.H.
3.10.98

~~A.H.~~

S W.

P. W. 43.
500—27-1-98.

again 10/ [illegible] 29. 9. 98

4.10.98

Home (1 & 2) 4–10–98

[illegible] 7/10/98

R 10-10-98

C. S.

this order was passed by the Hon. Messrs. Stokes and Garstin.

3. He enquired in May 1892 whether his removal from the service for insolvency debarred him from reentering Government service and he was informed in the affirmative. vide G.O.No. 397 Public dated 13th June 1892. This order was also passed by the Hon. Messrs. Stokes and Garstin. F

4. He appealed to Government for restoration to his former appointment and was told in G.O.No. 616 Public dated 2nd September 1892 that Government saw no reason to modify the order passed in his case. This order was approved by H.E. Lord Wenlock and the Hon. Messrs. Stokes and Garstin. E

5. His two subsequent appeals were also rejected by Government. vide G.Os.Nos. 934 Public dated 10th December 1894 and 612 Public dated 20th July 1893. Both of these orders were passed by the Hon. Sir Henry Bliss. G L

6. He submitted a Memorial to the Government of India and this was withheld in G.O.No. 1239 Public dated 19th November 1896. This order was also approved by the Hon. Sir Henry Bliss. M

7. On the 9th July 1897, he submitted a Queen's Day Petition praying that he might be granted a pension for his 17 years' service as an act of mercy and generosity in consideration of the completion by Her --- Majesty of her sixtieth year of reign. He was informed that his request could not be complied with and that further petitions from him would not be noticed vide G.O.No. 1138 Public dated 31st August 1897. This order was issued under the -- authority of the Chief Secretary. R

3

Flag Y

8. Another appeal of Mr. Robert's submitted by him direct to the Govt. of India was referred to this Govt. for report and the draft reply to the Government of India No. 684 Public dated 19th May 1898 stating that this Government had no recommendation to make on the clerk's behalf was approved by His Excellency and the Honourable Sir Henry Bliss. It is however not clear whether His Excellency read through the bulk of the papers in the case.

I wonder how this appears.
A H.

Flag Z

9. The reply from the Government of India declining to interfere in the matter was also seen by His Excellency.

10. Mr. Roberts was dismissed from the service as his schedule of debts showed that he was guilty of reckless borrowing by having signed pronotes for Rs. 100 receiving a consideration of only Rs. 10, 15 or 20. In his petition dated 27th May 1898

Mr. Roberts explained that he was duped by his brother-in-law in the preparation of his schedule, and that the statement therein made that he received between Rs. 10 to 20 for pronotes of Rs. 100 was false and entered by his brother-in-law through ill-will for the purpose of ruining him.

I forwarded+ this petition to the Public Department for merciful consideration with a request that the clerk might be declared eligible for reemployment in the Government service on the following grounds:-

+ Flag U.

(1) On the first occasion of his claiming the benefit of the Insolvent Act, he was placed under suspension under a rule which has since been abolished, thereby making it absolutely impossible for him to free himself from debt. This suspension was the probable cause of all his future troubles.

(2) It seems incredible that he could have been guilty of the reckless borrowing detailed in his schedule and ~~the undersigned is~~ I am willing to believe that his statement that he was duped is a truthful one.

?

(3) During his 17 years' service under Government he bore an excellent character.

Seen. A.G.H.

11. In the accompanying unofficial note dated 3rd August 1898, the Chief Secretary

5

Secretary states that the question of Mr. Robert's employment has been considered over and over again by different members of Government who have invariably decided that the clerk could not be reinstated and that he (the Chief Secretary) does not feel himself justified in again submitting the question for the orders of the Hon. Members. I beg therefore to inquire whether it is His Excellency's pleasure that no further action should be taken in the matter. The clerk is a man of large family consisting of wife and 10 children and has 17 years service. Although he cannot be reinstated in his former appointment, I recommend that he may at least be declared eligible for reemployment in the Government service.

29.9.98

W.

I fear this would afford a dangerous and inconvenient precedent. I do not think he should be readmitted to the Public Service.

A.G.H. 2.10.98

I have since remembered a precedent of my own creating. See my Note of to-day on page 1 of this Note.

A.G.H. 3.10.98

May

Please let me see the precedent

5/10/98

Precedents submitted. vide G.O. 1862/A W.o/ 23rd July 1898 in the linked file.

7.10.98

W

I regret that I can see no reason for modifying former orders. I think that Mr. Roberts should not be reemployed in Govt. service and should not be declared eligible for such reemployment. 6.10.98

I regret that I must

agree with the Hon. Mr. Arundel.
~~Doubt that the~~

HB
8/10/98

Seen.
A.S.H
27.10.98

C No. 8850.

DW

The accompanying draft is from orders of the Hon'ble Mr. Arundel & Sir H. Bliss, and under the Council rules must be circulated to H.E. who differs, before issue.

It is doubtful however whether this order can issue in the P.W. Dept. In para 3 of G.O. No. 781 Pub d/ 7.6.81 (Flag V) Govt. directed that all orders relating to insolvents be passed in the Public dept. alone. Under this order all previous petitions from Mr. Roberts have been dealt with there. The present petition was transferred to Public by Memo No. 617 D d/ 11.7.98. The Chief Secy. then intimated unofficially with reference to W's recommendation on Mr. R's behalf that he proposed to record the papers with reference to G.O. No. 1138 Pub d/ 31.8.97 in which Mr. Roberts was..

Roberts file

Note

1) G.O. 302 Pub d/ 4.5.92 directing
the removal of Mr. Roberts from the
Government Service was passed by
(1) the Hon. Mr. H. E. Stokes & (2) the Hon: Mr.
Garstin.
2) G.O. 397 Public d/ 13.6.92 ~~stating~~ declaring
~~that~~ Mr. Roberts ~~is~~ ineligible for re-
employment in any branch of the service
was also passed by the Same H. Ms.
3) G.O. 616 Public d/ 2.9.92. declining
o modify the previous orders ~~were~~ was
assed by H.E. Lord Wenlock and
the above two H. Ms.
4) Subsequent orders, viz, No. 934 Public
0.12.94, No. 208 Public d/ 21-3-95, No. 612 d/ 20th
ly 95, were all passed by the
Hon: Mr. Bliss.
5) Mr. Robert's memorial
the Govt. of India was withheld in
0. 1239 Pub d/ 19-11-96, where the
on: Mr. Bliss has remarked that "the
se has been considered over and
r again and by different member
Government"
In his letter addressed to the Chief
retary ~~for~~ submitting his memorial
Govt. of India, Mr. Roberts has
ted all the facts which he has
w brought forward in his presen
tion.

agree with the Hon. Mr.
~~Draft that the~~

A.S
27/10/98

Seen.
A.S.H
27.10

was told that further petitions from him would not be noticed. The question of Mr. Roberts' re-employment had been considered over & over again & the Chief Secy. did not consider that he was justified in again submitting it. On this the question was submitted by W in this dept. to H.E.

The draft G.O. is therefore marked to the Chief Secy. for counter-initials. If the Chief Secy. thinks that the order must issue in Public, the papers can then be transferred.

R.L.
28.10.98.

S.A.W.
~~This is not~~ The order did issue I think in the Public Dept.
Cird to W
A.K.
2.11.98.

SAW.
Draft amending Circ. to H.E.
A.S.
28 Oct 98

Roberts file

Note

1) G.O. 302 Pub of 4.5.92 directing the removal of Mr. Roberts from the Government Service was passed by (1) the Hon. Mr. H. E. Stokes & (2) the Hon: Mr. Garstin.

(2) G.O. 397 Public of 13.6.92 ~~stating~~ declaring ~~that~~ Mr. Roberts ineligible for re-employment in any branch of the service was also passed by the same H.M.S.

(3) G.O. 616 Public of 2.9.92 declining to modify the previous orders ~~were~~ was passed by H.E. Lord Wenlock and the above two H.M.S.

(4) Subsequent orders, viz, No. 934 Pub. of 10.12.94, No. 208 Public of 21.3.95, No. 612 of 20th July 95, were all passed by the Hon: Mr. Bliss.

(5) Mr. Roberts's memorial to the Govt. of India was withheld in G.O. 1239 Pub of 19.11.96, where the Hon: Mr. Bliss has remarked that "the "Case has been considered over and "over again and by different Member "of Government"

In his letter addressed to the Chief Secretary ~~for~~ submitting his memorial to the Govt. of India, Mr. Roberts has stated all the facts which he has now brought forward in his present petition.

agree with the Hon. Mr
~~[illegible]~~

HS
8/10/9

Seen
A.S.H
27

wa
pet
wi
of
ha
& o
di
wo
m
gi
W

therefore marked to the Chief Secy. for counter-initials. If the Chief Secy. thinks that the order must issue in Public, the papers can then be transferred.

RR
28. 10. 98.

S.A.W

~~this not~~ The order did issue I think in the Public Dept.

Cnd to W

A.H
2. 11. 98.

Chr. 8850

Note for H.C.
M.

This file should be circulated to H.E. on return from tour.

Maj

H.C.
a

H.C

Please say whether this file should be taken with record boxes

Yes
Maj

12-Oct 98

rs
ls
bs
f
A
s

Roberts file

Note

302 Pub of 4.5.92 directing
removal of Mr. Roberts from the
rnment Service was passed by
e Hon. Mr. H.E. Stokes & (2) the Hon: Mr.
stin.
G.O. 397 Public of 13.6.92 declaring ~~stating~~
~~to~~ Mr. Roberts ~~is~~ ineligible for re-
ployment in any branch of the service
s also passed by the same H.M.S.
G.O. 616 Public of 2-9-92 declining
modify the previous orders was ~~were~~
sed by H.E. Lord Wenlock and
above two H.M.S.
Subsequent orders, viz, No. 934 Pu
2-94, No. 208 Public of 21-3-95, No. 612 of 20th
95, were all passed by the
: Mr. Bliss.
Mr. Roberts's memorial
Govt. of India was withheld in
1239 Pub of 19-11-96, where the
: Mr. Bliss has remarked that "the
has been considered over and
again and by different Membe
overnment"
In his letter addressed to the Chi
tary ~~for~~ submitting his memoria
t of India, Mr. Roberts has
all the facts which he ha
brought forward in his prese
w.

(6)

agree with the Hon. M.
~~Draft that the~~
K S
8/10/98

Seen
A.S.H
27.

wa
pe
wo
of
ha
& o
di
wo
m
qu
W

therefore marked to the
Chief Secy. for counter-initials.
If the Chief Secy. thinks
that the order must issue
in Public, the papers can
then be transferred.

R.L.
S.A.W
28.10.98.

~~this not~~ The order did issue
I think in the Public Dept.
Send to W

A.H
2.11.98.

Roberts file

W C. No 22202

If the previous orders
are to be modified, it
will be necessary to circulate
the papers to at least
one other Hon. Member
under the Council Rules.

A.S.
4 Oct 98.

P/112

Yes. Letter should go
to both

4.10.98

Note

G.O. 302 Pub of 4-5-92 directing
e removal of Mr. Roberts from the
overnment Service was passed by
the Hon. Mr. H. E. Stokes & (2) the Hon. Mr.
erston.

G.O. 397 Public of 13-6-92 ~~stating~~ declaring
~~that~~ Mr. Roberts ~~is~~ ineligible for re-
ployment in any branch of the service
s also passed by the same H. M. S.

G.O. 616 Public of 2-9-92 declining
modify the previous orders ~~were~~ was
sed by H. E. Lord Wenlock and
above two H. M. S.

8. Subsequent orders, viz, No. 934 Pub
-4-94, No. 208 Public of 21-3-95, No. 612 of 20th
95, were all passed by the
: Mr. Bliss.

Mr. Roberts's memorial
Govt. of India was withheld in
1239 Pub of 19-11-96, where the
Mr. Bliss has remarked that "the
has been considered over and
again and by different Member
overnment"

In his letter addressed to the Chief
ary ~~for~~ submitting his memorial
t of India, Mr. Roberts has
all the facts which he has
brought forward in his presen

agree with the Hon. M.
~~Dont think the~~
KS
8/10/98

Seen.
A.S.H
27.

Roberts file

H.E.

Is there any evidence that H.E. has gone into this case thoroughly? I cannot find his initials

H.M.S.

J.D.G.

$\frac{0S}{112}$

W

Kindly see the accompanying note.

Khaj
8/8/98.

Note

G.O. 302 Pub of 4.5.92 directing e removal of Mr. Roberts from the overnment Service was passed by , the Hon. Mr. H. E. Stokes & (2) the Hon: Mr. aristin.

G.O. 397 Public of 13.6.92 ~~stating~~ declaring ~~that~~ Mr. Roberts ~~is~~ ineligible for re-nployment in any branch of the service as also passed by the Same H. M. S.

G.O. 616 Public of 2-9-92 declining modify the previous orders ~~were~~ was ssed by H. E. Lord Wenlock and above two H. M. S.

Subsequent orders, viz, No. 934 Public 2-94 No. 208 Public of 21-3-95, No. 612 of 20th 95, were all passed by the : Mr. Bliss.

Mr. Robert's memorial Govt. of India was withheld in 1239 Pub of 19-11-96, where the : Mr. Bliss has remarked that "the has been considered over and again and by different Member overnment"

In his letter addressed to the Chief-tary ~~for~~ submitting his memorial t. of India, Mr. Roberts has all the facts which he has brought forward in his presen w.

(6)

agree with the Hon. Mr.
~~[illegible]~~

8/10/98

Seen.

A.SH

27.1

Roberts file

Note

Flag C.W. (1) G.O. 302 Pub of 4-5-92 directing the removal of Mr. Roberts from the Government Service was passed by (1) the Hon. Mr. H. E. Stokes & (2) the Hon: Mr. Garstin.

Flag F (2) G.O. 397 Public of 13-6-92 declaring ~~stating~~ ~~that~~ Mr. Roberts ~~is~~ ineligible for re-employment in any branch of the service was also passed by the same H. M. S.

Flag E (3) G.O. 616 Public of 2-9-92 declining to modify the previous orders was ~~were~~ passed by H. E. Lord Wenlock and the above two H. M. S.

Flag G. Flag S Flag L (4) Subsequent orders, viz, No. 934 Public of 10-12-94, No. 208 Public of 21-3-95, No. 612 of 20th July 95, were all passed by the Hon: Mr. Bliss.

(5) Mr. Roberts's memorial to the Govt. of India was withheld in Flag M G.O. 1239 Pub of 19-11-96, where the Hon: Mr. Bliss has remarked that "the "Case has been considered over and "over again and by different member "of Government"

In his letter addressed to the Chief-Secretary ~~for~~ submitting his memorial to the Govt. of India, Mr. Roberts has stated all the facts which he has now brought forward in his present petition.

(6)

(6) In the notes attached to G.O. 1138 Public of 31-8-97, the Chief Secretary, after quoting the remarks of the Hon: Mr. Bliss above referred to, has recorded that "he must be "told that ~~he~~ no notice will be taken "of further petitions on the Subject". Flag R.

(7) The appeal of Mr. Roberts to the Govt. of India was referred to the Madras Govt. for report in their letter No. 805 G., of 24-3-98. Flag T. and the draft ~~letter in~~ reply to the Govt. of India (G.Os 683-84 Public of 19-5-98) was approved by the Hon: Sir Henry Bliss and His Excellency Sir Arthur Havelock. Flag T. This letter to the Govt. of India gives a brief history of Mr. Roberts' case but does not go into the representations now made by Mr. Roberts.

(8) The reply from the Govt. of India declining to interfere in the matter ~~of the~~ has also been seen by H. E. Sir Arthur Havelock. Flag Z

~~But~~ It is not possible to say whether H. E. has read thro' the bulk of the papers in the case.

8/8/98.

Keep this till H.E. returns then send up Mr Roberts' last petition & my endorsement hereon & C.S.'s diff. - & a brief statement of the various disposals as given here - & ask if it is H.E.'s pleasure that no further action shall be taken in the matter

9. 8. 98

---

ublic Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~2202~~ 8850

Rd 29-9-98

Regd: 25.10.98

Enclos 1 file.

From

The Public Works Department.

NOTE for the Secretary, P.W.D.

Order

No. 617 D.

I think this decision should be adhered to. A.H. 2.10.98

Dated 11th July 1898.

Received 12th ,, ,, ,,

Registered 12th ,, ,, ,,

Enclosures one

Spare copies

The question of Mr. Roberts' re-employment has been considered over and over again by different members of Government, and it has invariably been decided that he cannot be reinstated.

Under the circumstances, and in view of the fact that Mr. Roberts was told in G.O. 1138 Pub., dated 31st August 1897, that further petitions from him ~~woul~~ would not be noticed, I do not consider that I am justified in again submitting the question for the orders of the Honourable Members. I therefore propose merely to Record the papers, with reference to the G.O. quoted above.

2/8/98

To the Public Works Dept. (U.O.)

SUBJECT.

Transferring petition from Mr. S.T. Roberts dated 27th May 1898 for consideration with the request that he may be declared eligible for further Government employ.

01/112

No. 867 of 8-7-98 Pub orig ✓
" 912 " 15-7-98 " ✓
" 134 " 3-2-98 S.C. ✓
" 683-4 " 19-5-98 " orig ✓
" 1138 " 31-8-97 " " ✓
" 208 " 21-3-95 " ✓
" 44 " 21-1-95 S.C. ✓
" 934 " 10-12-94 Pub orig ✓
" 688 " 25-8-93 Public orig Consgl ✓
" 616 " 2-9-92 " orig ✓
" 397 " 13-6-92 " " ✓
" 396 " 13-6-92 " S.C. ✓
" 302 " 4-5-92 " orig ✓
" 1609 " 7-12-97 S.C. &c + other S.O. ✓
" 216 " 31-3-92 Public orig ✓
" 331 " 25-4-91 " S.C. ✓
" 789 " 21-11-90 " " ✓
" 684 " 9-7-88 S.C. ✓
" 466 " 3-5-88 orig ✓
" 336 " 31-3-88 S.C. ✓
" 753 " 2-6-87 orig ✓
" 552 " 5-7-95 S.C. ✓
" 612 " 20-7-95 orig ✓
" 679 " 10-8-95 – ✓
" R. No. 1364 " 22-11-95 ✓
" 1402 " 5-12-95 ✓
" 1239 " 19-11-96 ✓
& S.O. of G.O.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date
No 867	Pub	8 . 7	98.
912	"	15 - 7	98
134	"	3 - 2	98
683-84	"	19 - 5	98 & file

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

W. B. de Winton Esqre
Secretary to Government
Public Works Department.
&c &c &c
Ootacamund.

Sir,

With reference to Memorandum No: 273 (D) of 11th May 1898 I beg most humbly to lay my deplorable case for your merciful consideration and respectfully solicit you will be graciously pleased to submit it for the favourable consideration of His Excellency The Right Honourable the Governor.

After a long and faithful service of over 17 years, as Clerk in the Public Works Secretariat, and while in the III Class I Grade, I was removed from the service on the grounds of my having obtained the benefit of the Insolvent Act.

The reasons for my having been in pecuniary difficulties were really & solely due to unforseen circumstances, viz the protracted

and

and dangerous illness of my wife immediately followed by that of my child and in consequence the heavy expenses I had to meet on account of medicines, nourishment and various other domestic wants.

These reasons were fully explained to the Chief Engineer who was evidently satisfied, inasmuch as he very considerately & strongly recommended me in his Memo: No 4001 C dated 7th October 1890 for permission to obtain the benefit of the Act without suspension.

Having obtained the indulgence, I entrusted the preparation of my schedule to my late wifes' brother, who is a lawyers clerk, who promised to have everything done free of charge with the exception of the stamp fee Rs 30/-. This amount, I accordingly with some difficulty, obtained through a Mahomedan friend and paid to him with a memo of my debts to draw up my schedule. My brother in law misappropriated the amount and avoided me - After some time he was unexpectedly met by my wife and myself and was questioned about his conduct. He then said if I
got

got him another Rs 30/- he would do everything. I explained matters to my Mahomedan friends and again begged of him to get me Rs 30/-, which he very charitably obtained for me. Now Respected Sir, comes the real explanation of my "reckless borrowing". — Smarting under the rebuke, the day after I got this 30 Rs my brother in laws asked me to be at the Court between 2 & 3 oclock the following day, I accordingly went over when he asked me to set my signature in two or three places in my Petition & schedule, which he prepared and had ready, saying that was all that was needed. I then affixed the stamps and handed the papers to the Registrar, fully believing in my brother in law, and never for a moment doubting his good intention I did not look over the items; but to my surprise & horror on the day of the case I was struck dumb with astonishment when I came to know that I was made to state that I signed Pro: notes for Rs 100/- & more simply receiving Rs 10, 20, 30 &c, (which I solemnly assure you Sir I never did) I could not speak and the Judge adjourned my case to the
following

following week. Finding myself betrayed by my own brother-in-law, with ruin staring me and my family in the face, I approached Mr Gantz, Barrister-at-Law, who very charitably took up my case. To enable my securing Mr Gantz's services I had to borrow Rs 15/- more, and this amount also I obtained from my Mahomedan friend – Mr Gantz appeared for me on the day of hearing & obtained my discharge.

The remarks made in my schedule "Received Rs 10, 15, 20 &c & gave bond for Rs 100/- &c" are not at all required in a schedule. The only information required in the schedule are the following (1) Name of Creditor (2) Amount of debt (3) When contracted (4) Admitted or disputed – and in the remarks column, if any suit has been filed by the Creditor, the number and date of the suit had to be given – and the amount under (2) should be the decreed amount – but the additional entries made in my schedule were unusual and quite unnecessary – No Creditor would admit that he gave Rs 10 or 20 & took a bond for Rs 100/-

and

and no debtor with a knowledge that his schedule contained such entries sign such a schedule, as any sane man would know that it would ruin him – But the entries were wilfully made in my schedule with the view of ruining me and my family.

Such then Sir are the real facts of my case and the above explanation will clear away the idea that I recklessly borrowed – Indeed I solemnly state that were it not for my brother in laws perfidy my schedule would have been perfectly free from & would not have given cause for any fault being found for reckless borrowing.

I beg to give you my most solemn assurance that the facts urged above are nothing but the truth and the whole truth – A reference to Mr Syed Razya Hussain Kirmani Saib, a Clerk in the P.W. Secretariat, will prove my statements as to the traitorous conduct of my brother in law as he was fully aware of the whole transaction and very kindly helped me for the stamps and Counsels fee &c

During

During the tenure of my office I have rendered good service as was testified both by Colonel Shaw Stewart R.E. and Colonel Pennycuick R.E..

The former stating

"I have every reason to be satis-
"fied with the mode in which Mr
"Roberts has carried out the
"business of the Railway Branch
"Secretariat and should gladly
"see his pay increased"

And the latter

"Mr S. T. Roberts served as
"a Clerk in this office for seven-
"teen years during which he bore
"an Excellent Character" - vide
Memo No: 408 D of 16.9.92. ✓

I also beg to quote a testimonial given me by Dr A. Porter Surgeon-Colonel, Principal Medical Officer Mandalay under whom I served temporarily after my removal from the Pro Secretariat.

"Mr Samuel Trumbull Roberts has been a Clerk in my office since October last - He is a methodical reliable.

reliable man. He writes a good hand and works quickly. I paid him Rs 90 a month latterly".

Merciful Sir, the great sufferings I and my family are undergoing since my removal from the service and the heart rending spectacle of seeing the starvation of my wife and 7 children, the neglected education of the latter and my utter inability to provide the most ordinary clothing for them have been sufficient punishment for me, and under all these circumstances I earnestly implore that you will take my case into your merciful consideration & obtain for me my reinstatement in the office, or if this is not feasible send me to any Circle office - I have given 17 of the best years of my life for the service of Government and it is very hard to be sent adrift in the world without at least a pension.

As Merciful Sir, I most earnestly pray that if my reinstatement cannot be sanctioned, I may be sent

sent before the Doctor and if
he invalids me I may be granted
a small pension for my service
of 17 years, on which I and my
family may depend upon in
my declining age.

For which act of mercy
& charity I and my family
shall ever be deeply indebted
to you.

I beg to remain
Sir,
Your most Obedient and
Most humble Servant.
S. T. Roberts.
Late Clerk P.W. Secretariat

Mene and Lane
Pursewaukum
27th May 1898.

Enclosure to Public
G.O. 2202 of 1898

Current No 220

No. 617 D.

Government of Madras,

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

Endorsement
~~MEMORANDUM~~.

Ootacamund
Dated Madras, 11 July 1898.

Petition from Mr. S. T. Roberts dated 27th May 1898.

R
Go 1138 Pub / 31. 8. 97

Transferred in continuation of endorsement No. 3250 ~~[illegible]~~ C dated 19th July 1897 to the Public Department for -- merciful consideration with a request that Mr. Roberts be declared eligible for further Government employ on the following grounds:-

W
Go 331 Pub / 25. 4. 91

(1) On the first occasion of his claiming the benefit of the Insolvent Act, he was placed under suspension under a rule which has since been abolished, thereby --- making it absolutely impossible for him to free himself from debt. This suspension was the probable cause of all his future troubles.

(2) It seems incredible that he could have been guilty of the reckless borrowing detailed in his schedule and the undersigned is willing to believe that his statement that he was duped is a truthful one.

(3) During his 17 years' service under Government he bore an excellent character.

Secretary to Government.

The Public Department with papers in original.

Recd 11/7/98

P. W. 41.
1,000—28-2-98.