

Public Works (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 627 W

DATED 18th March 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Prosecution

Stating that Govt. does not consider it desirable to take any action in the matter of prosecuting piece workers for having defamed C. W. Subramanyam, an Assistant Subordinate, Malabar.

W.P.

HC
E.

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

READ the following:—

Letter from the Supt. Ingr., TV Circle

$$\text{No. } \frac{75}{W} \text{ of } 15.2.99$$

Circulated to

ORDER. No: 627 w 9 1.3.99.

The Govt. does not
consider it desirable to
take any action in this
matter, which should be
allowed to drop.

24-2-99. Cont
27/2/99

To
The Sept. Ingr. IV Circle

He trial
a ✓

Read the following:-

Letter from the Supty. Engr., IV Circle, No. 75/W
D 15.2.99

Circulated to

The Honble Mr. A. J. Arundel, Esq.

FOR ORDERS.

The Supty. Engr., IV Circle recommends that Supervisor C. N. Subramanya Aiyer, a Temporary Upper Subordinate employed under Mr. Somers, I.E.S. at Ootacamund, be given permission to prosecute a piece worker named Govind Nayak for defamation.

The Supervisor is charged with having borrowed various sums, aggregating Rs 500, on various different occasions from the piece worker. The Executive Engineer & the Supty. Engr. are both agreed that the charges are false & that the Supervisor has been victimized.

The case is stated to

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 1400

From

A. H. Garrett Esq
Supg Engineer & Coile

Order

No. $\frac{75}{W}$

Dated 15th February 1899

Received

Registered 16.2.99

Enclosures

Spare copies 18/2/99

SUBJECT.

Piece worker Govindarajulu
Recommends that super
visor G. N. Subramonia Sings
be given permission to
prosecute - for defamation

SKW

to be a complicated one, but
no papers have been forwarded,
scarcely any particulars
are given.

Under para 2, Rule 10,
App. E, Vol I of the P. W. Code.

(1) the Supervisor can only
vindicate his character in
Court with the permission of
Govt.

(2) if the permission is
granted, it is for Govt. to decide
whether it should bear the
costs of the prosecution or leave
the subordinate to institute
the prosecution at his own
pense.

It is submitted that
permission applied for may
granted, but there is no
reason why Govt. should bear
the costs of the case.

AKH
20.2.99.

It is submitted that
prosecution of this kind
is not advisable in the
interests of Govt. and should
result in a satisfactory
enclosure.

Ant
21/2/99

I quite agree. ^{It} Govt.
does not consider the charges proved
nothing more is needed - no papers
however have been sent up. But
in ~~neither~~ case is the process of
the complaint for defamation
desirable.

HT 23.2.99

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.	No.	Date.
179W	20.1.94 EC.		
863W	27.3.93 Hk		
1330W	27.6.92 Hk		
2785W	20.10.92		

Letter from J. F. Somers Esq. Executive
Engineer on special duty Ootacamund
to the Supg. Engineer H. C. Circle dated
11th February 1899 No. 588.

In continuation of Endorsement
No. 587 of 11th February 1899 on Gov.
Rajulu's petition to you, I have the
honor to inform you that after a
careful enquiry, I am of opinion
that the charges made by Govind
Rajulu against the Supervisor
C. N. Subramania Iyer that he
has lent him various sums on
different occasions amounting to
a total of Rs. 500, are false, and
I consider the Supervisor has been
victimized.

2. The papers containing the
evidence I have based my opinion
on have been shown to you, and
it seems unnecessary to forward
them, as you have expressed
yourself

complicated one, and the evidence
on both sides will only be properly
sifted in a court of law.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Yours most obedient servant.

Admiral
Supg. Engineer
4th Circle

14-299

com