Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 978 W

DATED 16th April 1898

[Despatch Abstract.]

P. Latchman Rau, late Head Clerk, Negapatam Division: Cancelling the reduction of — from Rs 80 to Rs. 50 and reducing him instead to the minimum pay of the Rs. 60-80 grade, rejecting clerk Mahadeva Pillai's appeal against transfer to the Chingleput Dn and calling on the S.E. to report as to how far ~~[illegible]~~ Sub Dn clerk Latchmana Mendr is to blame in the matter of the delay of certain gratuity papers in the Negapatam Dn.

DV
16 Ap 8

Indexed 16/4

P. W. 28.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
Fr B. Dn See Current 12070			File with 46 to 3C 11.11.97				

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

1

18

Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 12207

12070 / 12458

Order

From The Supdg Engineer 5th Circle

No. 497 W

Dated 8th December 1897

Received 9.12.97

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Papers connected with regard to the delay in submission of the Pension papers of Lascar Shaik Mustan. —

Requesting to return the —

Recd 22 Dec 97

OLS 3 / R 13/4

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

3

No. ~~497~~ 497 W/97.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V CIRCLE, MADRAS,
Chepâk, 8th December 1897

From
Colonel C. Rawson R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
V CIRCLE,

To
THE Chief Engineer,
P. W. Department.

SIR,

Enclosures.

The Examiner P. W. Accounts having forwarded for compliance a letter from K. Kuppuswami Naidu, late Accountant, Negapatam Division, requesting with reference to para 2 of G.O. N° 2873 W.× dated 12 October 1897, that certain papers which were submitted with letter N° 287 S.E. dated 15th July 1897 from the Executive Engineer Negapatam Division and transmitted with this office N° 261 W.× dated 2 July 1897 may be supplied to him through the Examiner, I have the honour to request that y will be so good as to return the papers for the purpose.

× Memo N° 3334 / 27-7-97
with Circ 11438
Sent to R-S for C.C. on 30-11-97

I have the honour to
Sir
Your most obed! Servan

8/12/97
Col. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer 5th Circ

7/1/97

500—11-3-97.

12390 / 158 / 397

Pension

Ix

Proposed to send this file on to H.E. the Governor –

It may be pointed out that the Sutelmana Sundr. the Sub divisional clerk, ~~22 days~~ 6 wks held responsible for only 6 weeks of the delay; that this was said to have been due to his being new to his work – If the man is to be punished for this, it is submitted that the S.E.'s opinion should be taken on the point – this might be done after the papers come back from His Excy –

Ds

Ds

Wd 22-3

Cy
22/3/98

H.E.

File to Governor by His Excy –

Cy
22-3-98

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 12458

Order

From The Supdg Engineer 5 Circle

No. 509 W.

Dated 14th December 1897.

Received 16th December

Enclosures 1

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Clerk T.R. Mahadeva Pill

Forwarding the appeal of – against his transfer from the Negapatam Division with a strong recommendation that it be rejected.

BACK PAPERS. 10 FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

No.	Date.

11

To.

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D. Madras.

Thro' the Supdg. Engineer 5th circle.

Most Honored Sir.

I beg most respectfully to submit the following circumstances to your honor's kind consideration and favorable orders.

2 - In accordance with your Office memo No. 1277. D. dated Ootacamund 2nd September/97 suggesting to the Supdg. Engineer, V. circle that, steps should be taken to remedy the hopelessly incompetent state of the Ex-Engineer's Office (Vizagapatam), that officer has, as one of the arrangements mentioned in his No. 280 N. G. d/ 10. 9. 97, ordered that I should be transferred to the Chingleput Division as a punishment and that I should not be promoted until I am specially recommended by the Executive Engineer.

3 - I have in obedience to the orders above quoted, joined my new appointment

on 11.10.97—

4— I was a clerk 4th class 2nd grade attached to the Vizagapatam Division, and on the recommendation of my superior Mr. R. Ry N. Ratnasabapathy Pillay avergal about two years ago, I was promoted to 4th class 1st grade and transferred to Superintending Engineer's Office Madras—(vide S. E's No $\frac{19 NG}{24.1.96}$)— But it was my misfortune then that owing to the very peculiar and difficult circumstances of my family, I had to forego the promotion so generously offered and to request to be allowed to stay at Vizagapatam— I was accordingly allowed to stay on the Executive Engineer's sympathizing and favorably recommending the grant of my request— As my family affairs have become worse since then and as this transfer is ordered to be made as

as a punishment to me, I am obliged to make a representation of my case with a view to shew how far I deserve the punishment ~~[illegible]~~ unsympathizingly inflicted on me—

5— When the Executive Engineer reported that I also was to blame for the delay that occurred in the submission of the pension papers of one Shaik Hussain Conservancy lascar, I hoped, I would have been given an opportunity to explain myself as per Code para 55 Chapter IV Vol: I, but unfortunately I was not given such that ~~opportunity~~ opportunity, and the case appears to have been disposed of solely relying on the report of the Executive Engineer—

6— The Ex. Engineer, vide para 10 of his report No 287. E.E dated 15-7-97, has charged me under the following heads – I beg to submit my Explanation thereon –

1 – "I think during the period of "more than a month he had charge, he "might have looked into the service books "and seen to their being all maintained "in order" – As regards this I beg to submit that, between the time Hd clerk Narayanasamy Pillay's leaving Vizagapatam Division on transfer to South Arcot Division on 8.2.96 and his successor P. Lutchman Row's joining on 16.3.96, I was ordered to do the work of the Hd clerk in addition to my own work – when I accordingly took charge from the former, he delivered to me the Register of service books maintained in the office in form No E-75

and the books detailed therein – These books have all been maintained in order and handed over by me to the permanent Hd clerk P. Lutchmana Row on his joining his duty on 16.3.97 – The books the Ex. Engineer refers to are, I believe, to be those of the Conservancy lascars, who were transferred to Work-Establishment vide G.O No 433 W dated 15-2-94 – It is a pity that, in the Register quoted above, no mention has been made about these books which appear to have been kept separate with the old records. Shaik Mustan, whose pension paper has been the Cause of these Correspondences, was one of the Conservancy lascars referred to above and his service book, together with another, appear to have been handed over to Kuppusamy Naidoo the then Accountant by Hd clerk - Narayanasamy Pillay on 20.12.95. so as to prepare the necessary pension papers under reference. i.e. more than a month and a half before I took charge (vide Narayanasamy Pillay's explanation dated 5/5/97 - para. 1) An Extract of which I beg to append hereto for ready reference -

" × × × I filled in the neces-
-"sary entries in the two service books
" concerned in ink or pencil, I cannot
" say which, and handed over the file
" on the 20th December/95 with the
" service books to the then Accountant
" M. R. Ry K. Kuppusamy Naidu to see to
" them or dispose of the reference or send
" it to you × ×" -

Thus it is evident that I was not in possession of the service book nor had I any chance whatever to have known

any thing about the book in question - Further I beg to add that, when the Executive Engineer investigated the case prior to his 1st report No 472 E.E. of 3.12.96, he, having found that these books were not entered in the Register, ordered to trace out the books & include them in the Register - The books were, only in July last, found out from some old records and were included in the Register, a third reference to which will bear testimony to my above statement - The Executive Engineer having ignored all these facts, has nevertheless included my name in his report as one who has failed to do his duty - While I was doing the duty of the Head clerk in addition to my own, between 8.2.96 & 15-3-96 I had very tight work and even had to work over time in order to have no arrears in office work - I regret that my hard service, instead of being appreciated and rewarded, have on the Contrary merited out a punishment - All these are due to my misfortune - I beg therefore to submit that I cannot in fairness be charged under this head -

11 - " He is able to work well - "though over (1) 51 but is not now (2) working "with a heart - x x x - now (3) that he "is found indifferent - I think he may "be transferred to another place as a "punishment -" As regards the first part of this I beg to state that I am not as old as the Ex. Engineer surmises me to be, for I am only 47 years of age - This statement would seem to have been made by him with a view to make me appear as one of those whom he designates in another part of his report as "time expired men" - As for the 2nd and 3rd parts, what he says is very vague, for it does not specify one single instance in which I have been found not working with heart and indifferent and it is not borne out by any record - On the other hand, about a fortnight after making the report in question blaming me also in part, the Ex. Engineer with Supdg Engineer's approval appointed me as Offg Hd clerk when the permanent incumbent went on leave - Thus it would seem that I have not been found not working with a heart and indifferent either before or after the report in question - The Ex. Engineer, who now tries to foist the blame on me while not at all concerned in this case, would certainly not have allowed to let me go scot-free if he had found me not

Office note for SE
as a temporary
(Office) arrangement

"not working with heart and indifferent."

I have served in the Department for more than 27 years and not one of my superiors before the present Ex. Engineer has said anything like this against me.

iii. "He declined the promotion "that was offered him a year ago & wishes "to be kept on in the Tanjore District only "till his retirement." In connection with this charge, I beg to submit that, when the promotion came I represented the peculiar and hard circumstances I was then in, to the Ex. Engineer & he fully sympathized with me and recommended to be left alone vide his No 39.SE / 28.1.96 - Copy of which I beg to append hereto for ready reference.

Endorsement on petition dated 28.1.96

No 39.SE "

"the Supdg. Engineer V. Circle for disposal -
"Under the circumstances represented I
"fear neither the service nor the appli-
"cant will gain by the transfer of the
"applicant to Madras - I regret I recom-
"mended him on account of his other
"qualifications and being ignorant of his
"circumstances private."

On this the Supdg. Engineer, realising my state of affairs as represented by the Ex. Engineer, made other arrangements leaving me alone untouched vide his No 27 N.S of 2-2-96 - From this it ~~[illegible]~~ appears that I did not wilfully decline the promotion but I had to request to let me forego it on account of my circumstances - This happened about twenty months ago - The Ex. Engineer gave it his full sympathy & support then — So that it is simply unjust that he should now represent it in a different light altogether and make it appear so blame worthy and to connect it with a matter in which I beg to say once more I had no concern whatever — I presume that he now puts this forth simply to prejudice the mind of the higher authorities against me —

7 — In conclusion I most respectfully beg to submit that I am in no way guilty of any of the charges the Ex. Engineer has been pleased to prefer against me & poison the mind of the Chief Engineer so as to make him deal with me in the way that I have been dealt with — Here I beg further to point out that

says in his report para 5 "I consider "therefore manager Kuppusamy Naidu is "responsible for the delay between January "and April" — I was doing the Hd clerk's duty only between 8th February & 15th March/96. I am not, therefore, in the least, to be blamed nor do I deserve the punishment awarded to me thus unjustly — To punish one, for no fault of his after a faultless service of more than 27 years, is without a precedent. My family and other circumstances now are far worse than they were when promotion was offered to me — I then requested to let me stay where I was even with the loss of any promotion — Now I am made to leave with punishment for no fault of mine — I therefore most humbly solicit that

Your honor will kindly reconsider my Case and do me justice.

I beg to remain
Honored Sir
Your most Obedient & humble
Servant
P. Mahadeva Pillay

26th November /97 } 2nd Clerk. E.E.'s Office Chingleput Dt
St. Thomas Mt. }

N
forwarded

26

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
ST. THOMAS' MOUNT
6 DEC 1897

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 1/779 C.H.
10 DEC 1897
V CIRCLE

Colonel C.C. Rawson R.E.

The Chief Engineer,
P.W. Department.

I have the honour to forward herewith an appeal from Clerk T.R. Mahadeva Pillai against his transfer from the Negapatam Division with a strong recommendation that it be rejected.

2. In consequence of the "hopelessly incompetent state" of the office of the Executive Engineer Negapatam, the Chief Engineer in his memo No. 1277 D dated 2nd September 1897 reduced the Head clerk of the Division. This man has appealed against his punishment, his appeal was forwarded with No. 4189 W dated 4th December 1897. He also ordered the transfer of second clerk Mahadeva Pillai as a punishment, his appeal is sent herewith.

3. Further in G.O. No. 2873 W dated 12 October 1897, the Accountant K. Kuppuswami Naidu was reduced for one year. This man also intends

27

No. 509 W.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V CIRCLE, MADRAS,
Chepák, 11th December 1897

From
Colonel C.C. Rawson R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
V CIRCLE,

To
THE Chief Engineer,
P.W. Department.

Enclosures.

SIR,

I have the honour to forward herewith an appeal from Clerk T.R. Mahadeva Pillai against his transfer from the Negapatam Division with a strong recommendation that it be rejected.

2. In consequence of the "hopelessly incompetent state" of the office of the Executive Engineer Negapatam, the Chief Engineer in his memo No. 1277 D dated 2nd September 1897 reduced the Head clerk of the Division. This man has appealed against his punishment, his appeal was forwarded with No. C.N. 12070 489 W. dated 4th December 1897. He also ordered the transfer of second clerk Mahadeva Pillai as a punishment, his appeal is sent herewith.

3. Further in G.O. No. 2873 W dated 12 October 1897, the Accountant K. Kuppuswami Naidu was reduced for one year. This man also intends

1095-C 4643 C
11438 A ... 15/12

to

500—31-3-97.

to appeal.

4. If these appeals be favourably considered and the punishments inflicted remitted, the whole of the authority of the Executive Engineer, Negapatam Division will be taken away and he will have to be moved from the Division. There seems to be no doubt whatever that the three men who were punished had made up their minds to do as little work as they possibly could and the combination was too strong for the Executive Engineer to cope with until the Chief Engineer came to his assistance and completely broke up the combination with the happiest results so far as the state of the Negapatam Division office is concerned.

I have the honour to be

Sir

your most obed^t Servant.

14.12.97 Col R.E.

Suptg Engineer 5^o Circle

W

In his letter of 15.7.97, the Ex. Engr reported regarding the first petitioner, Lutchman Row, "His booked age is 51 and I fear he is older".

By "booked age", he meant his age according to his service book, & this age must determine his date of retirement. He will thus be 52 this year, & it will be 3 years before he can retire under the 55 years' rule. He has not sufficient service to retire without medical certificate before he is 55.

As regards the 2^d petitioner, Mahadevan Pillai, the Ex. Engr

---

(1897) **Department.**

CURRENT No. 12070

From The Suptg Engineer
5 Circle

No. 489 W.

Dated 4^th December 1897.
Received 6.12.97
Enclosures 3.
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Petition of P. Lutchman Row late Head Clerk Negapatam Division at present attached to the P. W. Works as Head Clerk & Cashier Madras.

Forwarding the – with certain remarks.

be rescinded. with [illegible] then issued No. [illegible] 24

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
~~78~~	
3577W	22-12-97 ✓
4643C	11-11-97 ✓
2873W	12-10-97 ✓
1277D	2-9-97 ✓
910W	31-3-97 ✓
3678C	23-10-96 ✓
784C	11-2-96 ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

To

W. B. DeWinton, Esq.,
Chief Engineer and Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
through the Superintending Engineer, V Circle,
MADRAS.

The Humble Petition of P. Lutchmana Row,
late Head Clerk, Negapatam Division, at
present attached to the Public Works
Workshops as Head Clerk and Cashier,
Madras.

Most Respectfully Sheweth :—

1. That your Petitioner begs very respectfully to place the following representation for your honor's kind and generous consideration of the Chief-Engineer's Order No. 1277D, dated 2nd September 1897, and S. E's. No. 280 N. G. Dated 10-9-97, reducing your unfortunate Petitioner from his grade of Rs. 80 to Rs. 50, the originals of which are herewith attached.

2. That your Petitioner in submitting this representation respectfully begs to state that the punishment awarded to him is a most severe one giving him no opportunity of explaining and vindicating the charges preferred against him as laid down in the P. W. Code.

3. That your Petitioner has no hesitation in stating that if his unfortunate case is thoroughly investigated it will be found that his degradation was unjustifiable, and that the severe punishment deserves your honor's merciful consideration.

4. That the official career of your Petitioner beginning so far back as 1876, when he commenced his official life as a Clerk in the office of the Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Madras, on Rs. 15 and by dint of perseverance and industry gaining the approbation of his several superiors, gradually rose to the position of Head Clerk in the Department on a salary of Rs. 80 from which he has now been unjustly reduced for *no fault* on the part of your Petitioner.

5. That your Petitioner humbly prays that the following undeniable facts will be patiently considered. Your Petitioner begs first and foremost to refer to the letter from the Executive Engineer, Negapatam Division to the Superintending Engineer, V Circle, No. 472 (S E) dated 3rd December 1896, wherein that officer explains the delay in the disposal of the Petition submitted by Kavalgar Shaik Mustan Saib (now deceased.)

6. That your Petitioner assumed charge of his duties of the Negapatam Divisional office on the 16th March 1896 while the Petition of the above said Kavalgar was received long before his joining that appointment, and left undisposed of by that office for reasons your Petitioner regrets he is quite unable to assign.

7. That the Executive Engineer Negapatam Division before submitting his first explanation (Dated 3rd December 1896, No. 472) (S. E.) to the Superintending Engineer called upon your Petitioner and 2nd Clerk Mahadava Pillai to render explanations as to how the delay, noticed in the matter, had occurred, the Petitioner and the 2nd Clerk submitted their respective explanations accordingly on the 20th November 1896. Your Petitioner stated that he joined the Division only in the month of March 1896, and the 2nd Clerk, from whom Petitioner took charge gave him no information as to the existence of Kavalgar Shaik Mustan Saib's pension case. The 2nd Clerk, Mahadava Pillai, also in his explanation of 20th and 25th November 1896 states that the papers in question were with the Accountant Kuppoosawmy Naidoo, and he knew nothing about it and hence did not bring the matter to your Petitioner's notice when he (Petitioner) took charge. Petitioner begs to state that the Executive Engineer was quite satisfied with the above explanation of your Petitioner and thought there was no blame traceable to your Petitioner, and therefore omitted his name in his first explanation to the Superintending Engineer, (*Vide* No. 472. S. E. dated 3rd December 1896.)

8. That a subsequent reference having been made relating to the claims of the deceased Kavalgar by the Executive Engineer, enquiries were instituted in the office from which it was ascertained that the then Head Clerk Narayanasawmy Pillai, Petitioner's predecessor, had completed the necessary reference, and given the same to Accountant Kuppoosawmy Naidoo, who, though it was his duty to have the application, in question, speedily disposed of by the Executive Engineer kept it in abeyance, and what was still more singular that when Head Clerk Narayanasawmy Pillai was transferred to the South Arcot Division in February 1896, who was also conversant with the papers as well as Accountant Kuppoosawmy Naidu, and who (Narayanasawmy Pillai) had every advantage of disposing of the papers as he was in the office until February 1896 although he failed to discharge his particular portion of his duty, *has not been made blameable.*

9. That for this inaction on the part of Kuppoosawmy Naidoo and Narayanasawmy Pillay, in delaying the disposal of this reference, your unfortunate Petitioner has been so unjustly and summarily punished by a severe degradation.

10. That the Executive Engineer, in his 2nd explanation, dated 15th July 1896, No. 287, (S. E.) most emphatically states as follows regarding the delay of the pension papers in question.

I consider Manager Kuppoosawmy Naidoo responsible for the delay between January and April 1896. I cannot trace when the papers from Accountant Kuppoosawmy Naidoo were given over to the Clerical Branch; evidently, only when he was leaving for Kurnool. The papers were left with service books that were left in charge of Head Clerk, Lutchmana Row, who says he knows nothing of the same. Under the circumstances I consider Kuppoosawmy Naidoo most reprehensible.

11. That the Executive Engineer in shirking *the onus* on Kuppoosawmy Naidu, *and in endeavouring to exonerate and screen himself* from the difficulty of a satisfactory explanation, has very ingeniously passed uncalled for remarks questioning the competency of your unfortunate Petitioner, a tried servant of Government which will be found in para. 9 of that officer's letter already quoted above.

12. That in para. 10 of the same communication the Executive Engineer after blaming your Petitioner also throws responsibility on 2nd Clerk Mahadeva Pillai.

13. That your Petitioner respectfully submits that the *delay in disposing of the reference in question of Shaik Mastan Saib's gratuity* cannot be traced to him, as the Executive Engineer himself in his explanation, *most distinctly states* that he holds Kuppoosawmy Naidoo as *responsible for the delay*; but in his comments on Petitioner's official competency very prejudicially assails the career of the long, and acknowledged services of your unfortunate Petitioner as a Government servant by passing the following remarks :—

"The next person responsible is, I consider *Head Clerk, Lutchmana Row.* It was his duty to keep the service books. Had he been the eligible Clerk, as he ought to be, he would have traced the papers, but unfortunately a less incapable man I never came across. He has no memory, and what transpires to-day in the forenoon he cannot remember in the afternoon, I never thought he was so bad and *I ascribed, I regret the early delays to his being new to the Division, and his being ill of Cuddapah fever, and from the bad assistance he got from his assistants.* I do not consider any punishment of good to this man. His booked age is 51, and I fear he is older, his retention in service is no good either to himself or to the state. He has put in about 17 years service."

14. That from the above remarks it will be clearly understood by your honor that the Executive Engineer, who had no *previous knowledge of your Petitioner's abilities or his capacities* as a public servant, and how your Petitioner attained his present position in the Department on Rs. 80 per mensem, should have so suddenly conjectured within a short time that Petitioner was under his control to pass such unfavourable remarks against him. The very terms and language of the Executive Engineer are not only damaging to the official career of your humble Petitioner, but have injured him in his future prospects in life, and if the whole correspondence regarding Shaik Mastan Saib's case is perused it will be observed that your Petitioner is totally blameless in the matter. As to the weakness of memory imputed to your Petitioner by the Executive Engineer, he begs to state, that the Executive Engineer's remarks are erroneous, and what is most remarkable is, that the Executive Engineer after misrepresenting the character of your poor Petitioner, expresses also his contrition by the following remarks :—

"I regret the early delays to his being new to the Division and his being ill of Cuddapah fever and the bad assistance he got from assistants."

15. That from the above remarks of the Executive Engineer, *your Petitioner is unable to reconcile the language of that officer*, and Petitioner cannot see his way why the higher authorities in reducing him to the present lower grade *should have ignored the recommendation of the Executive Engineer.*

16. That your Petitioner begs earnestly to invite your honor's kind attention to the fact that the Executive Engineer after characterizing the conduct of Kuppoosawmy Naidoo as *most reprehensible* finds fault with your Petitioner also for the delay in the disposal of the gratuity papers in question. It must be particularly ascertained whether Mahadeva Pillai while handing over all papers to your Petitioner assuming charge of his duties in the Negapatam Divisional Office, mentioned the fact that Shaik Mastan's reference required *immediate attention.* The latter remarks of

Superintending Engineer, 5' Circle

the Executive Engineer as to the Petitioner's "retention" to himself or to the state. "is no good" is *very* unjust, and *too prejudicial*. As to the condemnation of the clerical staff of his office as described by the Executive Engineer, as "condemned and time expired men," your Petitioner begs to state that he should not be included under that category (*Vide* Memo. of Chief Engineer, dated 30th January 1896, No. 526 C) and Memo. dated 11th February 1896, No. 784 C) herewith submitted.

17. That while blaming one particular individual subordinate whom the Executive Engineer characterized as most "reprehensible," he now twists his remarks against your Petitioner in the matter. The subjoined dates will show how and by whom the delay of the gratuity papers under reference occurred.

1. Kuppoosawmy Naidoo and Narayanasawmy Pillai … … … From October 1895 to February 1896.
2. Kuppoosawmy Naidu … … … From February to May 1896.
3. Sub-Divisional Officer, Mannargudi … From 14th May to 27th July 1896.
4. In the Divisional Office, Negapatam … From 28th to 31st July 1896.

Hence it will be observed that no sooner the Reference was received from the Sub-Divisional Officer, speedy steps were taken by your Petitioner, and the then accountant, to prepare, and submit~~ted~~ the gratuity papers on the 1st of August 1896. There had been no delay on the part of Petitioner in the Negapatam office.

18. That it is also a matter of question how your poor Petitioner who was a stranger to this pending reference as stated above could be jointly held responsible with Kuppoosamy Naidoo, who was the *sole* custodian of the pension papers long before Petitioner took charge, and assumed his duties in the Negapatam office. The Petitioner begs to submit Kuppoosamy Naidoo, the responsible man for the delay noticed has, Petitioner learns, been temporarily reduced for *one year only*, while your unfortunate Petitioner who is perfectly innocent in the matter has been *permanently reduced*, and his public services already faithfully rendered stigmatised, and ignored and his future prospects to regain his former position, and *status* in the Department blighted in the evening of his life and on the eve of his retirement after arduous and long services in malarious Districts as Cuddapah, Kurnool, &c., his character should be so unjustly tarnished.

19. That your Petitioner during his long career in the Department has earned the approbation of several eminent, and experienced Superintending and Executive Engineers, as shewn hereunder, who have one and all testified to his intelligence, integrity, and aptitude for work which secured for your Petitioner his rapid promotion to the position of Head Clerk, and this fact itself is a clear proof of your Petitioner having been capable and useful. The very hard and severe punishment now inflicted on your Petitioner for no fault of his at the close of his retirement, is a matter for your honor's kind consideration.

1. Col. L. C. Conway Gordon, R, E., Examiner of P. W. Accounts.
2. Col. H. L. Prendergast, R. E., late Superintending Engineer, 2nd circle Bellary, now 3rd circle.
3. Honorable Col. J. Pennycuick, R. E., late Superintending Engineer, 2nd circle, Bellary, now 3rd circle.
4. Major ~~W.~~ C.H.P. Chrystic, R. E.
5. Major J. W. Hindle, R. E.

---

6. K. F. Nordmann, Esqr.
7. J. C. Johnston, Esqr.
8. Captain W. Jackson.
9. P. O'Ratigan, Esqr.
10. Watson, Esqr.
11. A. B. Todd, Esq.
12. Murray, Esqr.
13. Col. Fraser, R. E. and other Officers.

20. That in conclusion, this humble appeal is submitted for justice at the generous hands of your honor (as the Chief Head of the Department in which your Petitioner has spent the best portion of his life with devotion to the duties entrusted to him especially in the most malarial Ceded Districts prior to his recent transfer to Negapatam) and your honor will be pleased to take his unfortunate and lamentable case into your honor's kind and benevolent consideration, and after a kind and patient perusal of all correspondence connected with Kavalgar Shiak Mastan's gratuity papers for which your poor Petitioner has been so severely and unjustly punished and restore him to his former pay Rs. 80, which he has been drawing for nearly 7 years and the grade of which he has been enjoying for the last 13 years.

For which act of charity, your Petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

MADRAS,
29th November 1897.

R. Lutchmana Row

G. A. NATESAN & CO., PRINTERS AND PUBLISHERS, ESPLANADE

No. 113. S.E. 5 dated 30 November 1897.

Forwarded

H. Moss

General Superintendent & P.W. workshops.
30.11.97

No. 4897

Forwarded; I consider that the petitioner is quite unfit for the duties of Head Clerk of a Division, & I am inclined to think that the best thing to be done is to retire him from the service

Colonel R.E.
Superintending Engineer, 5 Circle
4/12/97

3a

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 1468
2 DEC. 1897
V. CIRCLE, P.W.D., MADRAS.

39

Current Nos 12070 &
12458 of 97

+ Flagged B1 – E

What is the petitioner's age? When will he have to retire?

31-1-98

W

In G.O. No 961 Pension dated 10.10.96, granting an invalid gratuity of Rs 16 to Lascar Shaik Husain (then deceased) of the Negapatam division, explanation was called for as to the delay of 8 months in submitting the application.

The Executive Engr's ~~application~~ explanation was received in Dec 1896, & after obtaining the accountant's explanation for his share in the delay, & the Engr's opinion thereon the papers were transferred to the Pension Dept. with this office endorsement No + 853 C of 11.2.97 –

The Pension Dept then issued G.O. [illegible] 24

Refer the matter again to Govt. for orders, as concisely as possible, writing up that portion of your note which refers to the substitution of L. Rs for L. Mud., & say that as the punishment has
+ Flagged D
already been awarded in this
apprehension ... [illegible]
+ Flagged E D
[illegible] with refce

of 20.3.97 – the Ex. Engr's explanation was considered in no degree adequate, & he was asked to submit a statement showing precisely where the papers were during the period from 31st Octr 1895 to 1st August 1896, & who was responsible for the delay which took place during the various stages, & to report what punishment it was proposed to inflict on the clerks at fault –

The Ex. Engr submitted his explanation of the statement with his letter No 287 S.S. of 15.7.97 +

The following is a brief abstract of the travels of the papers: –

In this endorsement say that the man cannot be retired without medical certificate before he is of age 55. He can only be ~~[illegible]~~ dismissed for misconduct or for inefficiency, & would then not be entitled to pension. Seeing that he has done good work in previous years, I consider that this would be much too severe a punishment, & I therefore + ~~suggest~~ recommend that in the remaining 3 years he has to serve he be reduced to the minimum pay of his scale, & posted as 2nd clerk to some Dy Office.

The other man has received forbearance.

11.1.98

S.D.O.'s report on amputation of the lascar,

Received by the Ex. Engr. on 9.11.95

Made over after registry to former Head clerk (Narayanasawmy Pillai) – – – 12.11.95

Draft to S.D.O. written by Hd. Clerk . . 12.11.95

Passed by Ex. Engr. – . – – – . 14.11.95

Despatched – . – – – 14.11.95

S.D.O.'s reply of 20.11.95, received by Ex. Engr – 26.11.95

Further reply to S.D.O. written by Hd. Clerk – 29.11.95

Passed by Ex. Engr – – . . . 30.11.95

Despatched – – – – . 2.12.95

S.D.O.'s reply of 4.12.95, received by Ex. Engr: 18.12.95

Made over to accountant after registry – . 20.12.95

Nothing more seems to have been done about this particular case, until receipt of a petition from the widow of the lascar on 11.5.96

Petition referred to S.D.O. on 11.5.96

Endorsement despatched – . – – 17.5.96

S.D.O.'s reply of 8.7.96 received by Ex. Engr – 11.7.96

Handed to Head Clerk Sabramani Row – 13.7.96

Pension application prepared by Head Clerk & handed to Accountant on . . 27.7.96

Passed by accountant on . . . – – . . 28.7.96

– . – " – Ex. Engr – . . – – 30.7.96

Despatched – – – – 3.8.96

(Between 13th July & 21st July 1896, the papers are said to have been passing to & fro between the Head Clerk and accountant –)

In his covering letter the Ex. Engr. holds the accountant, Kuppuswami Iyengar, responsible for the delay from January to ~~4~~ April 1896, but the correct period should have been stated as from 20 Dec 1895 to May 1896, when the Accountant was transferred to Kurnool –

The Ex. Engr. stated that he was unable to trace when the papers were handed over by Accountant Kuppuswami Iyengar to the Clerical branch, but ~~then~~ thought it must have been in May 1896, when the accountant was transferred – also that the papers were left with the service books which were in charge of Head Clerk Lutchmana Row, "who says he knows nothing of the same" – he

that he

considers the accountant "most responsible", & recommended that his promotion should be kept back for a year –

As regards the Ex: Engr's statement that he was unable to trace when the papers were made over by the accountant to the clerical branch, it may here be pointed out that the ~~app~~ papers appear to have been with the accountant from 20 Dec 95 to date of receipt of the widow's petition on 11-5-96 – the petition appears to have come in about the time the Ac=countant was transferred; & it was at once referred to the S.D.O. Nothing was then done until receipt of the S.D.O's reply on 11.7.96.

After apportioning

of blame, the Ex. Engr went on to say that the next person responsible was the Head Clerk Lutch:mana Row; that the Head Clerk had more than one paper connected with pension applications passing through his hands, & "had he been the eligible clerk he ought to be", he would have traced the papers. He added that the Head Clerk had no memory & thought that his retention in the service would be no good either to himself or the State.

As regards this, it may be remarked that Lutchmana Row joined the Negapatam division office as Head clerk, on transfer from Cuddapah, on 16.3.96. The pension papers were then with the accountant, & remained with the latter till May 1896. They [illegible] added

came to light on receipt
of the widow's petition on
11-5-99, and the petition
was at once referred to
the S.D.O. It is not clea
how the head clerk could
have interfered in traci
the papers which were w
the accountant, who wa
the office manager.

The next person
blamed by the Ex. Engr
was the 2nd clerk, Mahad
Pillai. This man acte
as Head clerk from Feb
to March 1896, in the
interim between the
transfer of the former
Head Clerk, Narayana
swamy Pillai, & the arr
of the new Head Clerk
Lutchmana Row. The
Ex. Engr thought that
Mahadewa Pillai, du
the man to be a[illegible]
might have looked
into the [illegible]
& "see to them all

"maintained in order", but how this would have helped forward the lascar's pension papers is not apparent. During the month of Mahadeva Pillai's incumbency, the pension papers were with the accountant, & the acting head clerk had nothing to do with them. However the Ex. Engr. stated that Mahadeva Pillai was not "working with a heart", that he had declined promotion in preference to leaving the Tanjore division, & that as he was "found indifferent", he should be transferred to another place as a punishment.

The whole case was reviewed in the Pension Dept: at Ootacamund in 1897, ~~& a~~ in the note & Colonel

+ Office note flagged H

Campbell was asked to suggest a more adequate punishment for the accountant than that suggested by the Ex. Engr. & to take steps to remedy the hopelessly incompetent state of the Ex. Engr's office.

Col: Campbell then suggested:—

(a) That accountant R. Kuppuswami Nayudu, who was the manager of the office, & directly responsible for the delay, should be reduced for one year from 7th grade on Rs 80, to 8th grade on Rs 60 per mensem.

(b) That the neglect of duty on the part of the Ex. Engr., should be noticed with displeasure.

(c) That, to remedy the hopelessly incompetent state of the office, the Head Clerk, Lutchmana Row, should be reduced.

(2) that the 2d clerk, Mahadeva Pillai, who was competent but indifferent & unwilling to leave the division even on promotion, should be transferred to another division as a punishment.

These proposals were approved by Govt. & orders were issued accordingly.

In the Pension Dept. note for orders, it was stated that it was clear that the accountant Kuppuswami Nayudu had the papers till he left for Kurnool in May, but that the further delay to August had not been explained.

A glance at the statement will however show

[illegible] from the

---

deceased Lascar's widow was received in May, about the time of the accountant's transfer, that this petition was referred to the S.D.O. by the Ex. Engineer's endt. of 11 May, that the S.D.O.'s reply came in on 11 July, that the papers were ~~[illegible]~~ then handed to Head Clerk Lutchmana Row on 13 July for preparation of the gratuity application, that references then passed between the Head Clk & the new accountant from 13 to 21 July, & that the Head Clerk Lutchmana Row, finally submitted the application complete on 27 July.

This accounts for the whole interval from May to end of July as far as the divisional office is concerned, but the for the delay from

50 – [illegible] in Jul

which occurred in the
Sub divisional office.–

Six weeks of the delay
in the Sub divisional office
was put down by the
Ex. Engr. to the Sub divn
clerk, Lutchmana Mudr.,
being new to his duties;
& in noting on the case,
the Hon. Mr Grose put
down this 6 weeks to
Lutchmana Row, the
Ex. Engr's new Head Clerk.
This case of mistaken
identity was probably
unfortunate for Lutchmana
Row.–

After Accountant
Kuppuswami Naidu's
reduction from 7th to 8th
grade was ordered, the
Govt pointed out that
the man ~~was~~ had been previously
promoted to temporary
6th grade, & suggested
that the punisht in-
[illegible] be re from the

+ G.O. No 3577 W. 22.12.97
flagged I

his permanent position of 7th
Grade.– On a reconsideration
of the case, & in view of
the fact that reduction from
7th to 8th grade for one year
meant a fine of Rs 240
for delaying the pension
papers for 5 months, the
Govt.+ modified the sentence
to reduction from 6th grade
tempy rank to 7th grade for
6 months, which amounted
to a fine of Rs 120.–

The Head Clerk
Lutchmana Row, and
the 2nd Clerk, Mahadeva
Pillai, have now
appealed against the
sentences passed on them.–

It appears that
the reduction inflicted
on Lutchmana Row
by the Supdg. Engr. in
accordance with the Chief
Engr's orders, was from
the grade, to the
50– 2nd gr., and then

he was put on the minimum
pay of the lower grade,
Rs 50 per mensem. He
had been 13 years in the
Rs 60-80 grade & had been
drawing the maximum pay,
Rs 80, for 8 years - His
punishment was ~~that~~
therefore a reduction of
pay to the extent of
Rs 30 per mensem - He
was further transferred
to the Workshop division,
& the Genl. Supdt. was told
by the S.E. that the man
was to have no increment
until further orders, & that
his conduct was to be
reported on every six
months.

The burden of
Lutchmana Row's petition
is that he had nothing
to do with the lascar's
pension papers until July

Current No 12070 of 97

completion, and that he
then promptly disposed of
the matter - This is borne
out by the transit statement.

The Ex. Engr. held
Lutchmana Row responsible
because he had charge
of the service books, &
therefore, if he had been
a competent clerk, he
would have traced the
papers - The papers were
however with the accountant,
and the 2nd clerk, Mahadeva
Pillai, says in his petition,
that the service books
of conservancy lascars
were not borne on the
register maintained by
the Head Clerk - It is
not at all clear ~~that~~
therefore how a scrutiny
of the service book register
would have helped
in tracing the pension
papers of lascar Shaik
[illegible]

It may be pointed out that although Lutchmana Row's punishment was the outcome of the delay in preparing this particular gratuity application, his reduction was ordered by the Chief Engr., not so much on that account, as to remedy the hopelessly incompetent state of the division office.

It may here be considered whether the man had had a fair chance of getting the office into better order than it previously was. He joined in March 1896, when the gratuity application was in the hands of the accountant, & he knew nothing of the papers until May, when the accountant was transferred. The Ex. Engr. admits that Lutchmana Row was

suffering from Cuddapah fever when he joined, & that he got bad assistance from the other clerks. It is possible, that in passing final orders, Lutchmana Row would not have caught it so heavily if the Hon. Member had not unfortunately mistaken his name for that of the subdivisional clerk, who was said to have delayed the papers for 6 weeks.

In forwarding the petition, the Supdg. Engr., Col Rawson, remarks "I consider that the petitioner is quite unfit for the duties of Head clerk of a division, and am inclined to think that the best thing to be done is to retire him from the service" —

As before remarked, it has to be considered whether the man had a fair chance of proving his position in the Vizagapatam division - He had previously been for many years Head Clerk of the Cuddapah division, & because he suffered much from fever there, ~~[illegible]~~ the Chief Engr. intervened in his favour (a thing which the Chief Engr. seldom or never does in the case of mofussil clerks) & got him a transfer to the V circle.

The efficiency of a division office moreover depends much on the Accountant, who is the office manager, & also on the strictness of the Ex. Engr. In reporting on the delay in the pension case, the Ex. Engr. admitted that he was suffering from a brooding

melancholy while the matter was going on.

The Ex. Engr. reported that Lutchmana Row had no memory & this no doubt is a serious defect in a Head Clerk - Admitting that he was not so efficient as he used to be, it must be considered whether he deserved the harshness with which he was treated after over 20 years service, and whether he deserved a permanent reduction from Rs 80 to Rs 50 per mensem, Rs 30 at one stroke.

If his removal from the position of Head Clerk, and his ~~[illegible]~~ consequent reduction, was ~~[illegible]~~ inevitable, it may be considered whether he might not have been put on the maximum pay of the lower grade, Rs 60, instead of the minimum, Rs 50, under Art. 171(b) C.S. Regns. This itself would have been a reduction of Rs 20 per mensem.

With regard to the Supdg. Engr's suggestion, it may be pointed out that Lakshmana Row has not sufficient service for a retiring pension and is not 55 years of age. He cannot therefore be retired, and if he is considered deserving of removal from the service, he can only be dismissed without pension.

The 2nd Clerk, Mahadeva Pillai, also complains+ that he was punished when he had suffering, to do with the

+ Current No 12458 of 97.

delay in the pension case. This man was transferred from the Negapatam divn. to the Chingleput divn. but suffered no reduction.

The Ex. Engr. brought him into the chain of responsibility because he was acting Head Clerk for a month in February & March 1896, and during this month he might have seen to the service books being maintained in order. Seeing however that the pension papers were with the Accountant when Mahadeva Pillai was acting Head Clerk, & that the service books of Conservancy Lascars were not kept with those in charge of the Head Clerk, it is not at all clear ~~[illegible]~~ how the 2nd Clerk could have been connected with the delay anyway. The Ex. Engr.

68

reported that the man was
indifferent about his
work, & that he was not
working "with a heart",
& his transfer too was
ordered not so much
as a punishment for the
delay, as to remedy the
incompetent state of the
office — In reporting on
the petition, the Supdg. Engr.
says that the Accountant,
the Head Clerk & the 2nd
Clerk had made up
their minds to as little
work as they possibly,
& that the com-
bination was too strong
for the Ex. Engr. to cope
with; that the break
up of this combination
has had the happiest
results for the Divn. office,
& he recommends that
the representations of
all three men be
rejected. Of the
Supt
of Mahadeva

61

Pillai was necessary for
the efficiency of the Nagapatam
division office, it ~~was~~ would
of course be impossible
to send him back there.
He prays for justice —
Apparently the only justice
which can be done him
is to exonerate him from
any share in the delay
connected with the Ranis
pension papers —

For orders.

Ca
29.1.28

62

63

7

[43/50]

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 12070 & 12458 of 97

(2) HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

~~THE HON'BLE SIR HENRY BLISS~~, K.C.I.E.

(1) THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

SUBJECT. Appeals against punishment from two clerks formerly of the Vizagapatam Dvn. office

FOR ORDERS.

+ Flagged B.

∴ Flagged E.

The Secy to Govt Pension Dept. for favour of counter-initials

[illegible]

In G.O. No 961+ Pension, dated 10th July 1896, granting an invalid gratuity of Rs 16 to lascar Shaik Imdan (then deceased) of the Vizagapatam division, explanation was called for as to the delay of 8 months in submitting the application. On the reports then received, the Pension dept. issued G.O. No 242∴ d/ 20.3.97 – the Executive Engineer's explanation was considered in no degree adequate, & he was asked to submit a statement showing precisely where the papers were during the period from 31st Octr 1895 to 1st August 1896, and who was responsible for the delay which took

64 8

place during the various stages, and to report what punishment it was proposed to inflict on the clerks at fault.

The Executive Engr submitted his further explanation, & the statement called for, with letter No. +2895-E. of 15-7-97.

+ flagged F.

The Statement+ shows that a report on the unfitness of the lascar was received in the Executive Engr's office in Novr 1895, and that after some intermediate correspondence with the Sub divisional officer, the papers were handed to the Accountant, Kuppuswami Nayudu, about the middle of December 1895. This man did nothing in the matter until his transfer to Kurnool in May 1896. A petition was then received from the widow of the deceased lascar, and this was referred by the Executive Engr to the Sub Divl officer on 11-5-96. Nothing was done again until Sept

+ F,

9 65

1896, when on receipt of the Sub divisional officer's reply, the gratuity application was completed towards the end of that month by the Head Clerk, Lutchmana Row.

The Ex. Engr considers the Accountant, Kuppuswami Nayudu, mainly responsible for the delay, and recommended that his promotion should be kept back for a year.

He then went on to say that the next person responsible was the Head Clerk, Lutchmana Row; that the Head Clerk had more than one paper connected with pension applications passing through his hands, & "had he been the eligible Clerk - i.e. ought to be", he would have traced the papers. He added that the Head Clerk had no memory, & he thought that his retention in the service would be no good either to himself or the State.

It may be pointed out however, that Lutchmana Row joined the Negapatam division office as Head clerk, on transfer from Cuddapah, on 16.3.96. The lascar's pension papers were then with the Accountant, & remained with the latter until May 1896. They came to light on receipt of the widow's petition on 11-5-96, & this petition was referred to the Sub-divisional officer. It is not clear how the Head Clerk could, before this, have traced the papers, which were with the Accountant, who was the office manager.

The next person blamed by the Ex. Engr. was the 2nd Clerk, Mahadeva Pillai. This man acted as Head Clerk from Feby to March 1896, in the

---

interim between the transfer of the former head clerk, Narayanaswami Pillai, & the arrival of the new head clerk, Lutchmana Row. The Ex. Engr. thought that Mahadeva Pillai, during the month he acted, migh have looked into the Service books, and "seen to their all being maintaine in order", but how this would have helped forward the lascar's pensio papers is not apparent. Dur the month of Mahadeva Pillai's incumbency, the pension papers of the lasca were with the accountant, and the acting head clerk had nothing to d with them. However, th Ex. Engr. stated that Mahadeva Pillai was not "working with a heart", th he had declined promotio in preference to ~~[illegible]~~ leaving the Tanjore distric and that as he was "fo indifferent". he should be transferred to another place as a punishment.

The whole case was reviewed in the Pension Dept. in the note flagged G, & Colonel Campbell was asked to suggest a more adequate punishment for the Accountant than that suggested by the Ex. Engr. and to take steps to remedy the hopelessly incompetent state of the Ex. Engr's office.

Col. Campbell then suggested:+ —

+ Office note flagged H.

(a) That Accountant R. Kuppusami Nayudu, who was the manager of the office & directly responsible for the delay, should be reduced for one year, from 7th Grade on Rs 80 to 8th Grade on Rs 60 per mensem.

(b) Mr. Pillai the neglect of duty on the part of the Ex. Engr. should be noticed with

displeasure.

(c) that to remedy the hopelessly incompetent state of the office, the Head Clerk Subramania Row, should be reduced, and

(d) that the 2nd Clerk, Mahadeva Pillai, should be transferred to another division as a punishment.

These proposals were approved by Govt. & orders were issued accordingly.

In the Pension Dept note for orders, it was stated that it was clear that the accountant, Kuppusami Nayudu, had the papers till he left for Kurnool in May 1876, but that the further delay to August had not been explained. The statement however shows that the widow's petition was received in May, and was referred to the Sub divisional officer

Yes: but the delay from May to July is still not accounted for.

by the Ex. Engr's endorsement of 11th idem. The Sub divl. officer's reply was received on 11th July, & the papers were handed on the 13th idem to the Head Clerk, Lutchmana Row, for preparation of the gratuity application. References then passed between the Head Clerk and the new accountant from 13th to 21st July, and the Head Clerk, Lutchmana Row, finally submitted the application complete on 27th July.

This accounts for the whole interval from May to end of July as far as the divisional office is concerned, but not for the delay from May to early in July which occurred in the Sub divisional office.

Six weeks of the delay in the Sub divl. office was attributed

by the Executive Engineer to the Sub divisional clerk, Lutchmana Moodeliar being new to his duties, and in noting on the case, the Hon. Mr. Grose put down this 6 weeks to Lutchmana Row, the Ex. Engr's new head clerk. This case of mistaken ~~[illegible]~~ identity was probably unfortunate for Lutchmana Row in the final disposal of the matter.

The accountant's punishment has been modified to reduction from 6th grade temporary rank to 7th grade for a period of 6 months, and the Head Clerk Lutchmana Row, & the 2nd clerk, Mahadeva Pillai, have now appealed against the sentences passed on them.

It appears the

R

the reduction inflicted on Lutchmana Row by the Supply Engr. in accordance with the Chief Engr's orders, was from the Rs 60-80 grade to the Rs 50-60 grade, & that he was put on the minimum pay of the lower grade, Rs 50 per mensem. He had been 13 years in the Rs 60-80 grade, & had been drawing the maximum pay, Rs 80, for eight years. His punishment was therefore a reduction of pay to the extent of Rs 30 per mensem. He was further transferred in a subordinate position to the Workshop division, & the Genl. Supt. was told by the Supply Engr. that the man was to have no increments until further orders, & that his conduct was to be reported on every six months —

The burden of proof

7

Lutchmana Row's petition is that he had nothing to do with the pension papers until July 1896, when the case was handed to him for completion, & that he then promptly disposed of it — this is borne out by the Tamil statement.

The Ex. Engr. held Lutchmana Row responsible because he had charge of the service books, and therefore, if he had been a competent clerk, he would have traced the papers — the papers were, however, with the accountant, and the 2nd Clerk, Mahadeva Pillai, says in his petition that the service books of Conservancy lascars, were not borne on the register maintained by the Head Clerk. A scrutiny of the service book register would not therefore have helped in tracing

was this verified

the gratuity papers of Lascar Shaik Mustan.

It may be pointed out that although Lutchmana ~~Lutch~~ Row's punishment was the outcome of the delay in preparing this particular gratuity application, his reduction was ordered not so much on that account, as to remedy the hopeless incompetent state of the division office. But it may also be pointed out that the man had hardly a fair chance of getting the office into better order than it previously was. He joined in March 1896, when the gratuity application was in the hands of the Accountant, and he knew nothing of the papers until May, when the Accountant was transferred. The Exec. Engr. admits that Lutchmana Row was

But ought he not to have known?

Did he?
SH

suffering from Cuddapah fever when he joined, & that he got bad assistance from the other clerks. It is ~~possible~~ Certain that in passing final orders, Lutchmana Row would not have been punished as severely if the Hon. Member had not unfortunately mistaken his name for that of the Sub divisional clerk, who was said to have delayed the papers for 6 weeks.

In forwarding the petition, the Supdg. Engr. Col. Rawson remarks. "I consider that the petitioner is quite unfit for the duties of Head Clerk of a division, & I am inclined to think that the best thing to be done is to retire him from the service" – As already remarked, the man had scarcely a fair chance of proving his position in the Negapatam division. He had previously been for many years Head Clerk of the Cuddapah division office, & because he suffered much from fever there, he was transferred to Negapatam.

As his punishment was awarded under a misapprehension (viz. mistaking his name for that of the sub division clerk, Sitaramma [illegible] 2) it is recommended that it be now rescinded. ?

His loss of memory is no doubt a serious defect in a Head Clerk, but with regard to the Supdt. Engrs endorsement, it is pointed out that the man cannot be retired, without medical certificate before the age of 55. He can only be dismissed for misconduct or for

inefficiency, & he would then not be entitled to pension. Seeing that he has done good work in previous years, the undersigned considers that there is no ground for so severe a punishment. It is recommended that he be reduced to the minimum pay of the Rs. 60-80 grade & retained ~~[illegible]~~ for the remaining 3 years he has to serve, in his present subordinate position in the workshops.

The 2nd Clerk, Mahadeva Pillai, also complains that he was punished when he had nothing to do with the delay in the pension case. This man was transferred from the Negapatam to the Chingleput division, but suffered no reduction. Seeing that his transfer was affected

78 22

to remedy the incompetent state of the Negapatam division office, it is considered that the man has no real grievance – It is recommended that he be informed accordingly –

Cs

4.3.98

SRON
1/3/98

Pension Dept 5-3-98. 2388 R 1-4-98

---

3 29

[16]

PENSION DEPARTMENT.

RW C. No.s 12070 + 12458/97

Note From the Public Works Dept. on appeals against punishment on two clerks formerly of the Negapatam Division Office

~~Dated~~ ~~189 , No.~~

FOR ORDERS.

The P.W.D. note is on the ~~appleas~~ appeals from 2 clerks formerly of the Negapatam Division who have been punished for delaying the pension papers of a lascar .

The 2 clerks are

(1) P.Lutchmana Row,(Head Clerk.),

(2) Mahadeva Pillai,2nd Clerk.

Lutchmana Row was reduced from Rs. 80 to Rs. 50 & transferred to the P. W.Workshops,Madras.The P. W. D. now says that the punishment of reduction from Rs. 80 to Rs. 50 was awarded to Lutchmana Row under [illegible] mi[illegible]hension (viz., mista[illegible] na[illegible] for that of the sub-d[illegible]isional clerk Lutchmana Mudaliayar) and proposes to modify the punishment into reduction to the minimum pay of the 60-80 Rs grade and to retain him for the remaining three years he has to serve for pension in his present subordinate position in the Workshops.

Reference is respectfully solicited to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Grose on page flagged [G] which runs as follows:-

"He says Latchmana Row the new H.C. was new to his duties and this explains 6 of weeks of the delay."

Against this remark the P.W.D. has made the following pencil note:-

"The man mentioned in the statement as new to his work and who was responsible for 6 weeks' delay, was not Latchmana Row the Ex: Engineer's Head Clerk, but Latchmana Mudaliar, the Sub-Division clerk."

* Please see portion marked in red pencil on page flagged. F,

It is not known whether the H.M.'s remark was made with reference to the Ex: Engineer's note about Latchmana Mudaliar in the statement, As regards Latchmana ~~Mudaliar~~ Row's share of blame in the matter, please see the Ex: Engineer's remarks about him in the letter flagged F and the following extract from the Accountant's letter to the Ex: Engineer dated 29-12-96.

E,

"When the Tamil petition from the wife of Shaik Mustan with the Ex: Engineer's Endt. thereon was received in May 1896 for the payment of gratuity, the file was not with me. The Head clerk finding some Endt. on the petition in question appears to have despatched it quietly without even taking care to know what the contents

of

---

of the petition were and whether there ~~are~~ were any previous papers in connection therewith. It should have been his duty or that of the Registering clerk to have put up the necessary papers on being registered and taken to your notice; this they failed to do. They are therefore to be blamed in the matter."

B.

The pension papers were, with the Accountant Kuppusami Naidu until his transfer to Kurnool in May 1896. The widow's petition was received in May 1896 & was sent on to the Sub-Divisional officer for submission of the lascar's pension papers, although the necessary papers were in the Ex: Engineer's office at the time. The Sub-Division officer returned the petition back with the remarks that there was nothing in his office to show about the services of the lascar. The gratuity application was then prepared in the Engineer's office. The delay from May to August 1896 could have been avoided, if the papers had been traced in the Ex: Engineer's office on receipt of the petition from the widow. In his petition d/ 29-11-97 Latchmana Row says that he prepared the gratuity application about the end of July 1896, but he does not say from whom he received the necessary papers or how they were found out.

× The Ex. Engr. remarks that the papers were left with Service Books that were left in charge of Hd. Clerk, Latchman Row, who says he knows nothing of the same. ses

Orders are solicited as to whether in the circumstances stated the punishment awarded to Latchmana Row should be modified. ~~As regards the second clerk~~

150
82 6

As regards the 2^d clerk who was transferred from Negapatam as a punishment, the P.W.D. says that he has no real grievance and that he may be informed accordingly.

FOR ORDERS.

The Ex: Engineer in forwarding these two petitions says as follows:-

A,

"If these appeals be favourably considered and the punishments inflicted remitted, the whole of the authority of the Ex-Engineer, Negapatam Division, will be taken away and he will have to be moved from the Division. There seems to be no doubt whatever that the three men who were punished had made up their minds to do as little work as they possibly could and the combination was too strong for the Ex: Engineer to cope with until the Chief Engineer came to his assistance and completely broke up the combination with the happiest results so far as the state of the Negapatam Division office is concerned."

JH
12.3.98

Secy

The Hon Member possibly was misled by the similarity of name but it is quite certain that the Ex Engr the Supdg Engr & Col Campbell ~~made no mistake when~~ were under no misapprehension when they recommended the punishment of Lakshmana Row who, it is submitted fully deserved what he got. That is however a matter for the D.P.W. All that concerns this Dept is that the person responsible for delaying the pension papers should be punished. If the D.P.W. is satisfied that the delay was with Lakshmana Mudali

then, I submit, we may accept the finding & ask for his punishment which the P.W.D. note does not seem to ~~suggest~~ contemplate.
14/3/98

42

83
1 2

H.M.

It is admitted that even if there was a confusion between Laxshman Rao & Lakshman Mud^r., some portion of the delay is attributable to the former who was the Head Clerk during a part of the period. We need not object to the DPW's proposal to modify the pt. ~~[illegible]~~ to reduction to the bottom of his grade i.e. from R80 to R60 pay, & his retention there for the rem^g. three years of his service. Alike, his appeal dismissed.

But something sh^d apparently be done to Laxshman Mud^r. & the DPW may be asked to deal with him.

As to the appeal of the 2^d clerk we need not object to the proposal of the D.P.W. to dismiss it.

S. K. 14/3/98

Yes, I did ~~[illegible]~~ make a mistake between the Row & the Mudaliar, & this ought to have been noticed in the office. Lakshman Row was in fault however & the proposed punishment seems to be right.

J.G.
A.4.4

J.G.
19/3/98
A.5.4
29.3.98

To D.P.W. &c
S. K. 19/3/98
with G.O.s 710/17-9-97, R. 242/30-3-97 & 961/10-10-96
16/3/98
19/3/98
Reason in ogh. the kindly returned

P. W.
500—27-1-98.

84

2

85 P.W. **DEPARTMENT.**

B
Gen. orders

Papers to be read in Proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Again G.O., dated 189 , No.

Current No. 12070 of 1897, dated 4-12-97, from the S.E. V circle

" " 12458 " 1897, " 14-12-97, " —do—

" " 12207 " 1897, " 8-12-97, " —do—

ORDER. No: 978 W. dt 6-4-98

The Govt. observes that P. Lutchmana Row, late Head Clerk Vizagapatam division, cannot be held responsible for the delay in the submission of the gratuity papers of Lascar Shaik Mustan, up to May 1896, but that on the receipt of the widow's petition in that month, he might have traced the papers, & have brought to the notice of the Ex. Engr. that a reference on the petition to the Sub divisional officer was unnecessary — He is therefore in some measure responsible for the delay from May to August 1896.

Dis
W Maint

P. W.
500—27-1-98.

On reconsideration, the Govt. is of opinion that the punishment awarded him of reduction to the minimum pay of the Rs 50 to 60 grade was too severe, and that ~~pay~~ punishment will accordingly be cancelled.

^But as the Supdg Engr reports that he is quite unfit for the duties of Head Clerk of a Division Office,

^ ~~He~~ he will ~~instead~~, from the same date, be reduced to the minimum pay of the Rs 60-80 grade, & be retained in his present subordinate position in the P.W. Workshops.

2. The second Clerk, T.R. Mahadeva Pillai, was transferred to remedy the hopelessly incompetent state of the Vizagapatam division office, & he suffered no reduction in grade. The Govt. considers that he has no grievance, & his appeal is accordingly rejected.

3. As the statement submitted with the Ex. Engr's letter No 2875-E. dt 15th July 1897, showing the stages through which the

gratuity papers passed from October 1895 to August 1896, there is an entry to the effect that 6 weeks of the delay in the sub-divisional office was due to the sub-divisional clerk, Sutchmana Iyengar, being new to the division. The Supdg. Engr. will report his opinion as to how far this man was to blame, & as to whether he deserves any, & if so, what punishment.

CWM
2/4/98

L Bell
11.4.98

S.E. V Circle with 3 enclos of his endt No 4897 W dt 4.12.97 & endt 1517 of his estimates 261 W dt 20.7.97.

Engr Memo
Pension Dept. with 3 [illegible]
[illegible]

Sd 16/4/98