1899 3209/11

Public Works (~~189~~ 7) Department.

536-7 W

G.O., No. ~~3118-9W~~ 7

DATED ~~5th Novr 98~~ 21st Feby 1899.

~~[illegible]~~

[Despatch Abstract.]

A. Runga Rau, late Accountant P.W.D.,

Ordered that the memorial addressed to the Secretary of State by — praying that his case may be ordered to be reviewed by the Govt of India, be forwarded to the Secretary of State through the Govt of India.

Forwarded.

10-11-97

[P.W. 24. 5,000—30-11-96.]

Indexed. 24/2

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

DEPARTMENT.

Public Works DEPARTMEN

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following.

Letter from A. Runga Row, late accountant, dated 28th March 1897, submitting a memorial to the Secretary of State for India.

536 Wg 21 Feb 99

Order thereon ~~No 3118 Wg 10-11-97~~

The Memorial will be forwarded to the Secretary of State, through the Government of India.

(True extract)

~~Under~~ Secretary
Ag

To

A. Renga Row, late accountant

P. W. 40.
1,000—3-8-97.

BACK PAPERS

No. ~~3119 W~~ 537 W

DEPARTMENT.

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

To

The Secretary to the Government of India,
Public Works Department.

21st Feb 2 1 99

~~18th November 1897.~~

Sir,

I am directed to forward, for transmission, a memorial addressed to the Secretary of State for India by A. Runga Row, late Accountant, Public Works Department, praying that his case may be ordered to be revilwed by the Government of India.

2. The circumstances which led to the petitioner's dismissal from the public service were laid before the Government of India in this office letter No. 2833 W dated 7th November 1894 and it does not seem necessary to recapitulate them. In your letter No. 43 A.E. dated 9th March 1895, it was stated that the Government of India had carefully considered Runga Row's petition and did not think the case one in which it should interfere with the discretion exercised by the Government of Madras. In November 1895, he petitioned this Government, praying that he might

P W. 42.
500—22-4-97.

might be granted the pension due to his 26 years' service, but although the request was supported by Mr. J. S. Sherlock-Hubbard and his successor, Mr. D. C. Gordon, this Government decided that the case had properly been met by dismissal, which carries with it loss of pension.

3. In March 1896, Runga Row again submitted a petition to this Government, begging that he might be granted a pension or that his re-employment might be sanctioned, but His Excellency the Governor-in-Council declined to reopen the case. In April 1896, he submitted a second petition to the Government of India, and on this occasion the whole circumstances of the case were carefully reviewed by this Government. It was decided that there were no grounds for reconsidering the former orders of Government and as no new facts had been brought forward, the transmission of the memorial was withheld under clause (3) rule 3 section III of the rules for the submission of memorials to the Government of India.

In my letter No. 2863 W dated 5th October 1896, which was a reply to your No. 2133 G. dated 25th August 1896, the Government of India was informed that Runga Row was not dismissed in 1893 without the fullest and most careful consideration having been given to his case, and that His Excellency the Governor in Council had only recently reviewed the circumstances anew, and had come to the conclusion that the punishment of dismissal was fully deserved.

The present memorial to the Secretary of State is forwarded through the Government of India under Rule IV of the Rules for the transmission of memorials to Her Majesty's Home Government, but this Government sees no reason to make any recommendation in favour of the petitioner.

5. In conclusion I am directed to explain that the despatch of this letter has been delayed by an (error of judgment) on the part of the Chief Engr.

oversight.
AJH

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your most obedient servant
J. B. Brunton
Ag Secretary

ACK
11.2.99.

Cmt
11/2/99

[P. W. 46.
1,000—26-2-97.]

from A. Runga Row, late accountant

DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Letter from A. Runga Row, late Accountant, dated 28th March 1897, submitting a memorial to the S. of S. for

536 W. of 21st Feb '99

No ~~3118 W. of 10-11-97~~

The memorial will be forwarded to the Secy. of State, through the Govt. of India.

A.SH
4.11.97

1. A. Runga Row, late accountant - P. 4/2/99

H.E. No ~~3119 W. of 10-11-97~~
537 W. of 21st Feb '99

To The Secy. to the Govt. of India
P. W. D.

Sir,

I am directed to forward, for transmission, a memorial addressed to the Secy. of State for India by A. Runga Row, late Accountant P. W. Dept., praying that his case may be ordered to be reviewed by the Govt. of India.

A.SH

2. The circumstances which led to the petitione

2-11-'99. Honourable Mr. Arundel

dismissed from the ~~[illegible]~~ public service were laid before the Govt. of India in this office letter No. +2833 W dated 7th November 1894, and it does not seem necessary to recapitulate them. In your letter No. ⊕43 A.E. dated 9th March 1895 it was stated that the Govt. of India had carefully considered Runga Row's petition, and did not think the case one in which it should interfere with the discretion exercised by the Govt. of Madras. In November 1895, he petitioned this Govt., praying that he might be granted the pension due to his 26 years' service, but although the request was supported by Mr. J. S. Sherlock-Hubbard, & his successor, Mr. D. C. Gordon, this Govt. +decided that the case had properly

+ Flagged G.

⊕ Flagged F

+ G.O. No. 2951 W. d/ 19.11.95
flagged H

been met by dismissal which carries with it loss of pension.

3. In March 1896, Runga Row again submitted a petition to this Govt. begging that he might be granted a pension or that his re-employment might be sanctioned, but ~~H.E.~~ the Govt. +in Council declined to reopen the case. In April 1896, he submitted a second petition to the Govt. of India, and on this occasion, the whole ~~facts~~ circumstances of the case were carefully reviewed by this Govt.+ It was decided ~~that that~~ there were no grounds for reconsidering the former orders of Govt., and as no new facts had been

+ G.O. No. 1056 W. d/ 24.3.96
flagged D.

+ G.O. No. 2360 W d/ 14.8.96
& attached notes – flagged J.

2.11.99. Honourable Mr. Arundel

brought forward, the transmission of the memorial was withheld under Clause (3) rule 3, Section III of the rules for the submission of memorials to the Govt of India –

+ vide page 56 of Vol I Pro code

4. In my letter No 2863 W. dated 5th Octr 1896, which was a reply to your No 2133 of dated 25th August 1896, the Govt. of India was informed that Runga Row was not dismissed in 1893 without the fullest and most careful consideration having been given to his case, & that H.E. the Govr in Council had only recently reviewed the circumstances anew, and had come to the conclusion that

+ Flagged B.

+ Copy put up –

the punishment of was fully deserved –

5. The present memorial to the Secy. of State is forwarded ~~to~~ through the Govt of India under Rule IV of the Rules for the transmission of memorials to H. M.'s Home Govt., but this Govt. sees no reason to make any recommendation in favor of the petitioner –

I have &c.

13/4/97

Desp. with memorial & 18 enclos 21/4/97

V.C.

Let me see Range Rao's file again. If it has not gone back to Mr Arundel

27.1.99

W

File submitted. It was about to go to Mr Arundel

27/1/99

Returned. I thought my note was not quite accurate, but it seems to be so. Send it on Mr. unless you can point out any inaccuracy

27.1.99

Sent to the Honourable

27/1/99

HIS EXCELL
THE HON'BL
THE HON'BL

C.A.10

Please re-write
as corrected by

16/1/99

16/1/99

DW

9. ....Department.

CT.

despatch 3119 W
to India, and d
P and Home Member
73rd B.

ance with the
distributions' re-
added a para
dated 10 Nov/97,
for His Excellen-

note by the Hon Mr Arun-
a sealed cover, get,
in the confiden-
Mr de Wi-
ly.

del
9

to para 5
to two
I would
by an error
substituted for
error of

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

C. No.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

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

THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

SUBJECT.

Failure to despatch 3119 W. 10 Nov/97 to India, and orders of H.E. and Hon Member on note flagged B.

FOR ORDERS.

x Flag B.

In accordance with the Hon'ble Mr. Whitebotham's remarks, I have added a para to letter 3119 W. dated 10 Nov/97, to Govt of India, for His Excellency's approval.

Appd. A.S.H.

2. The note by the Hon Mr. Arundel circulated in a sealed cover, has been lodged in the Confidential box pending Mr. de Winton's return to duty.

Seen A.S.H.

A.C.K.
11.2.99.

With reference to para 5 of the draft letter to the Secy. G. of I. P.W.D. I would suggest that "by an oversight" be substituted for the words "by an error of judgment".

Appd.
A.S.H.
15.2.99

C.A. 10
Please re-write letter to Govt, as corrected by H.E.

A.C.K.
16.2.99.

Before I look into the record of this case I shall be glad if the Secy. will note how it is that G.O. No 3118-9 dd 10th Novr. 1897 forwarding Runga Row's memorial to the Secretary of State, has not been issued.

It was passed by H.E. on 4.11.97. On 9.3.98 the late members of Govt. Sir Henry Bliss & Mr. Grose recorded their opinion that the former decision of Govt. was right & that the case should not be reopened.

How is it then that the der of Govt. ~~it~~ has not ssued?

ASA 25.1.99.

N
sa
Dec
time

I wa
before
Decision
think

P.T.O.

My note for orders w
written on 23.11.97
& remained in circulat
until ~~10~~ 12.3.98. When
it returned I kept
by me intending to spe
personally to Sir H. Bl
on the subject, quite
forgetting that any defini
orders of Govt. had bee
passed before my No
for orders was written
The opportunity for speakin
to Sir H Bliss never
came, & I did not, in fact,
reopen the file until I
sent it to Hon. Mr Arundel
in Decr. last, when I
discovered that the orders
passed had never issued

W.A.C.
26.1.99

ave been through the
cord of this case and
entirely satisfied that
e dismissal of Runga
ow was the only appropriate
enalty for his misconduct.

his defence in the matter of
plaint ~~brought~~ filed against him
by Vengama Naidu &c. is obviously
false. p. 3 of E in C. No. 6892
Disp. No. 2905 C. of 18th Augt 93.

he case is clearly reviewed &
ummarized by Sir H. Stokes in
is note of 20/10/93. who confirmed the order
of dismissal, and I am fully in accord with him.
he decision arrived at by
Sir H. Stokes was ~~three~~ ~~three~~ four times
confirmed by H.E. Lord Wenlock
(H.E.'s note 21st March '94; P.S.'s note
refusing an interview &c. 6.4.94; and
Lord Wenlock's ~~[illegible]~~ initial of 4th Novr. 1894
in letter to Govt. of India forwarding
Runga Row's petn:; finally
Lord Wenlock's note of 15th Novr. 94.)
It was then confirmed by
H.E. the Governor on 21-3-96,
and again on 9.8.96.
At H.E.'s request the case was

I have come to the
Same Conclusion
H.S.

again gone into by Sir H. Bliss
and Mr. Grose who both
noted their concurrence
with the former decision
on 9th & 10th Octr 1896.
H.E. counter-initialled these
notes on 18th Octr 1896.
On the 4th Novr. 1897 H.E.
initialled the covering letter
to the ~~Sec~~ Govt. of India forwarding
Runga Row's memorial to the
Secy. of St. This letter was
not despatched.

At the request of the Secy.
Mr. De Winton, H.E. again
requested Sir H. Bliss & Mr.
Grose to look into the matter
once more & they both again
on the 9th & 10th March 1898
onfirmed their former
pinions.

para 6. of his present note
e Secretary proposes that
vt. should forego its own
ction of coming to a
sion on the evidence
pt the opinions held in
our of Runga Row by
six officers of the D.P.W. whom he
names.

N
sa
deci
time
Yes

I wou
before a
decision
think that

[redacted]

~~[illegible]~~ It is to be regretted that the Secretary did not quote or refer to in para 6 of his note the strongly adverse opinion held of Runga Row by Mr. Hammond, then I suppose acting Secy. to Govt. I find this in the note containing Sir H. Stokes's summary — It is as ~~[illegible]~~ follows "When I was Supg. Engineer in the Kistna I had frequent complaints from contractors about this accountant's pecuniary dealings with them, ~~and~~ the conclusion I came to was that he had such dealings with them. There were some very suspicious circumstances in connection with the acceptance of tenders. I don't think he is a fit man to have as accountant."

The argument in para 6 however is one that cannot be entertained.

I ~~see~~ that Runga Row's memorial to the ~~Sec.~~ of S. dy 28th March 1897 has not yet been disposed of or despatched.

It falls under Rule XII of the A. Memorial Rules.

A further note for circn. is enclosed in a sealed cover - not to be opened in the office.

[illegible] 1.99.

I find no sufficient ground to believe that in respect of the Suit Runga Row was the victim of a false charge — I concur that the dismissal, & consequent forfeiture of pension must stand —

Some explanation of the delay in forwarding the memorial seems indispensable, & I think ~~must be~~ the blame must be put on the proper shoulders by saying that the meml. was delayed by the C. Engineer by an error of judgement

HS

9-2-99

They should be despatched without further de[illegible]

A.S.H

4.3.9

GOVERNMENT OF M

Public Works Department,

Chepâk,

18 Jan 1898.

My dear Arundel

In your letter of 4th January, which I received on my return from tour, you entirely misunderstand my attitude in the matter of Ranga Row

---

NB. I saw him. The decision against [illegible] was before my time HS

and his work and their opinions were given when the case was fresh in their minds. I therefore agreed with them that the case should not be re-opened. But, Mr. de Winton has now written so strongly about it, that I feel bound to ask Hon. Members to consider his views and representations.

Yes, in 93

JG

A.S.H

7.3.98

I went into all the case before & thought that the former decision of Govt. was right. I don't think that so old a case should be re-opened

HS

9/3/98

JG 10/3/98

DEPARTMENT.

SUBJECT.

S.

ost earnestly beg that Govt.

pleased to consider once --

matter of the dismissal of

t A. Runga Row, because I --

believe that we, otherwise,

serious risk of punishing

severity an innocent man.

e not had time yet to go

e whole of this very voluminous file, but the original papers on the subject were sent to me by Runga Row in 1892 (I think) he having served under me in the Godavari for several years, and been one of the best accountants I ever had. I then went through them very carefully, & came to the conclusion that he had been convicted on insufficient evidence, and I now see that I am supported in this opinion by all the officers of the Department who have studied the case since it was first decided.

3. Runga Row was practically dismissed on one charge only, all the

[redacted]

~~It~~ It is to be regretted th

he Secretary did not quote

efer to in para 6 of his note the ot

dverse opinion held by

then I suppose acting S

o by Mr. Hammond. I fin

his in the note containing S

tokes's summary — It is

~~[illegible]~~ follows "When I was Supt.

n the Kistna I had frequent c

plaints from contractors ab

the accountant's pecuniary

with them, and the conclus

I came to was that he had such

dealings with them. There were some very suspicious circumstances in connection with the acceptance of tenders. I don't think he is a fit man to have as accountant."

The argument in para 6 however is one that cannot be entertained.

I ~~see~~ that Runga Row's memorial to the ~~Sec~~ of S. dy 28th March 1897 has not yet been disposed of or despatched.

It falls under Rule XII of the A. Memorial Rules.

A further note for circn. is enclosed in a sealed cover - not to be opened in the Office.

delay in forwarding the memorial seems indispensable, & I think it must be the blame must be put on the proper shoulders by saying that the memorial delayed by the C. Engineer by an error of judgment.

W.S.
9-2-98

They should be despatched without further de

A.G.H
4.3.9

[43/500]

C. No.

SUBJECT.

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

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

THE HON'BLE MR. GROSE, C.I.E.

NOTE TO GOVT. **FOR ORDERS.**

When I wrote my Note of 22.7.96 on papers flagged 8, I had some doubt in my mind as to whether or not the punishment inflicted on Runga Row was too severe. Hon. Members knew the man and his work and their opinions were given when the case was fresh in their minds. I therefore agreed with them that the case should not be re-opened. But, Mr. de Winton has now written so strongly about it, that I feel bound to ask Hon. Members to consider his views and representations.

A.G.H
7.3.98.

NB. I never saw him. The decision against him was before my time. H.S.

Yes, in 93

I went into all the case before & thought that the former decision of Govt. was right. I don't think that so old a case should be reopened.

H.S.
9/3/98

J.G. 10/3/98

I most earnestly beg that Govt. will be pleased to consider once more this matter of the dismissal of Accountant A. Runga Row, because I sincerely believe that we, otherwise, run very serious risk of punishing with great severity an innocent man.

2. I have not had time yet to go through the whole of this very voluminous file, but the original papers on the subject were sent to me by Runga Row in 1892 (I think) he having served under me in the Godavari for several years, and been one of the best accountants I ever had. I then went through them very carefully, & came to the conclusion that he had been convicted on insufficient evidence, and I now see that I am supporte in this opinion by all the officers of the Department who have studied the case since it was first decided.

3. Runga Row was practically dismissed on one charge only, all the

[illegible] 14.1.99 [illegible] 15.1.99 [illegible] 14.1.99

remainder being either disproved, or so trivial as to be very sufficiently punished by his previous reduction. This one charge was his alleged improper dealings with a contractor and the single item of evidence on which he was convicted was the fact that he compromised the case for Rs. 300. But everyone who knows India knows that absolutely false charges, begotten of private enemity, abound, and that there must be many instances of innocent men, who have preferred to suffer blackmail rather than -- risk the consequences of fighting them in a court of law. That Runga Row paid the money is, no doubt, a suspicious circumstance, but it is not proof nor anything like it, and there is no other evidence of his guilt.

4. I do not say that he is not guilty, but I do say that there is reasonable doubt in the case, and that he, in common with every accused man, should be given the benefit of it.

5. I also say that he has never had a perfectly fair chance of exonerating himself. The Examiner, who first brought the charge, did it in a manner which is not creditable to his sense of fair dealing, and has

Note 2[illegible] 64/[illegible] 11-8[illegible]
R290
3118-[illegible]

I don't find this. He says that "personally" ~~[illegible]~~ he would be glad if Runga Row could have a pension.
AA

has since, app[illegible], repented of his action. The accountant was made to reply to the charges in a very --- short time and without access to documents, which were necessary to his defence.

6. I am quite prepared, if permitted, to go into the matter fully, and place it again before Government, but I would respectfully ask, first, if it is not possible ~~to~~ for Government to place sufficient confidence in the responsible officers of this Department named in the margin x who are -- unanimous in believing that the accountant has been convicted on insufficient evidence, to warrant a decision in favour of the accountant, and the grant of a pension.

x Mr. D. C. Gordon, late Examiner, P. W. Accounts,
Col: Chrystie, R.E. -do- -do,
Col. Campbell, R.E,
Mr. Burlton,
& myself.

7. There are two alternative risks to be run.

(1) The grant of a pension to a man who was guilty, after ~~a~~ long meritorious service, of a serious offence;

(2) the severe punishment and condemnation to penury of an innocent man who served the -- State well for 26 years,

and, as the responsible adviser of Government in this matter, I solemnly aver, with a full sense of that responsibility, my belief that the --- second

second risk is much the greater of the two.

W. B[illegible]

23.

W.

e[illegible]

wh[illegible]

in

to hi[illegible] // W... 8-3-98 R

11-4-98 ... 1-11-97

Note F.D. [illegible]

2290. Pattee, dy 3.11.[illegible]

3118-19W, dy 10.11.97 ✓

2865W, dy 5.10.96 ✓

2864W, dy 5.10.96 ✓

2862-63W, dy 5.10.96 ✓

3222C, dy 31.8.96 ✓

2360W, dy 14.8.96 ✓

1876C, dy 7.4.96 ✓

~~[illegible] dy 7.4.96~~

1056W, dy 24.5.96 ✓

2957W dy 19.11.95 ✓

687W, dy 21.3.95 ✓

2832-33W, dy 7.11.94 ✓

1635C, dy 11.4.94 ✓

833W, dy 29.3.94 ✓

2760W, dy 29.10.93 ✓

1349W, dy 18.5.93 S.C. ✓

1086W, dy 18.4.93 ✓

4134W, dy 24.4.93 ✓

880W, dy 20.3.93 ✓ Se orig.

151W, dy 21.1.93 S.C. ✓

409C, dy 31.1.93 ✓

1460C, dy 28.3.93 ✓

37W, dy 11.1.93 ✓

3037W, dy 5.11.92 ✓

2555W, dy 14.5.92 ✓

1819C, dy 2.4.96 ✓

1753C, dy 6.5.95 ✓

2948C, dy 25.8.93 ✓

2905C, dy 18.8.93 ✓

1474C, dy 29.3.93 ✓

1014C, dy 4.3.93 ✓

925C, dy 28.2.93 ✓

684C, dy 13.2.93 ✓

320C, dy 24.1.93 ✓

5465C, dy 23.12.92 ✓

5340C, dy 16.12.92 ✓

585 A, dy 24.10.92 ✓

2203W, dy 9.9.92 ✓

I most earnestly beg that Govt.
will be pleased to consider m
views in this matter of the dismissa
of Acct. A. Ranga Row, because I
sincerely believe that we, otherwise,
run very serious risk of punishing
with great severity an innocent man

2. I have not had time yet to go thro
the whole of this very voluminous
file, but the original papers on the
subject were sent to me by Ranga
Row in 1892 (I think) he having
served under me in the Godavari
for several years, & been one of the
best accountants I ever had.
I then went through them very care-
-fully, & came to the conclusion tha
he had been convicted on insuffic
evidence, & I now see that I am
supported in this opinion by othe
officers of the Dept who have stud
the case since it was first decide

3. Ranga Row was practically dismis
on one charge only, all the remaind
being either disproved, or so trivial a
to be very sufficiently punished by

second risk is much the greater of

the t

his alleged improper dealing with a contractor – & the single item of evidence on which he was convicted was the fact that he compromised the case for Rs 300. – But everyone who knows India knows that absolutely false charges, weapons of private enmity, abound, & that there must be many instances of innocent men, who have preferred to suffer blackmail rather than risk the consequences of fighting them in a court of law. – That Runga Rao paid the money is, no doubt, a suspicious circumstance, but it is not proof nor anything like it, & there is no other evidence of his guilt. –

4. I do not say that he is not guilty, but I do say that there is reasonable doubt in the case, & that he, in common with every accused man, should be given the benefit of it.

5. I also say that he has never had a perfectly fair chance of vindicating himself. – The Examiner who first brought the charge did it in a manner which is not creditable to his sense of fair dealing, & has since, apparently, repented of his action. – The Acct was made to reply to the

What

Mr D.C. Gordon
late Examr P.W.A.
Col Chrystie R.E. D.G.
Col. Campbell R.E.
Mr Hamilton.
& myself.

without access to documents which were necessary to his defence. –

6. I am quite prepared, if permitted, to go into the matter fully, & place it again before Govt – but I would respectfully ask first, if it is not possible for Govt to place sufficient confidence in the responsible officers named in the margin of this Dept – who were unanimous in believing that the acct has been convicted on insufficient evidence, to warrant a decision in favour of the acct, & the grant of a pension.

7. There are two alternative risks to be run.

(1) the grant of a pension to a man who was guilty, after long & meritorious service, of a serious offence,

(2) the severe punishment, & condemnation to penury of an innocent man who served the State well for 26 years.

& as the responsible adviser of Govt in this matter I solemnly assert with a full sense of that responsibility, my belief that the second risk is much the greater of the t

3040 C, of 26.12.92
585 A, of 24.10.92

second risk is much the greater of the two.

Public Works (1897) Department.

CURRENT No. 3209

Order

From

A. Runga Row

Dismissed accountant

P.W.D.

No.

Dated 28. 3. 97

Received 30. 3. 97

Enclosures 18

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Memorial to the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for India praying that his case may be ordered to be reviewed by the Govt. of India.

W. 29.
16-11-96.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
2865 W &	5-10-96 ✓
2864 W -	5-10-96 ✓
2862-3 W -	5-10-96 ✓
3222 C -	31-8-96. ✓
2360 W -	14-8-96. ✓
1876 C -	7-4-96. ✓
1056 W -	24-3-96. ✓
2951 W -	19-11-95. ✓
687 W -	22-3-95. ✓
2832-3 W -	7-11-94 ✓
1635 C -	11-4-94 ✓
833 W -	29-3-94 ✓
2760 W -	27-10-93 ✓
1349 W -	18-5-93. ✓
1086 W -	18-4-93. ✓
1134 W -	24-4-93. ✓
880 W -	30-3-93. ✓
1460 C -	28-3-93. ✓
409 C -	31-1-93 ✓
151 W -	21-1-93. ✓
37 W -	11-1-93. ✓
3037 W -	5-11-92 ✓
2703 W -	29-9-92. ✓
2555 W -	14-9-92 ✓
1819 C -	2-4-96 ✓
1753 C -	6-5-95 ✓
2948 C -	25-8-93 ✓
2905 C -	18-8-93. ✓
1474 C -	29-3-93. ✓
1014 C -	4-3-93. ✓
925 C -	28-2-93. ✓
654 C -	13-2-93. ✓
589 D -	24-10-92 ✓
[illegible]	[illegible] ✓

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

To

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Madras

Most respected Sir,

I beg most respectfully to submit herewith my memorial addressed to the Secretary of State for India in council, and to request the favor of your kindly forwarding the same

I beg to remain
Most respected Sir
Your most obedient Servant

Madras
28th March 1897

A Rungarow
Late Accountant P.W.D
Madras