

[$\frac{G}{H}$]

Recd
6 Feb 2/3

ORDINARY, MS.

<i>Public</i>	DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED 27-2-93.	
No. 15-6.	

INDEXED.

When given for copying.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Directing that Mr. H. B. Rangayya
Naidu be informed
that the Govt. de-
clines to interfere
with the orders of
the Suez Canal
in his case.

From

SURG. MAJOR-GEN. W. F. DEFAECK, M.D.,

SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

Madras,

No. 164

Dated 16th February 1893.

Recd.

No.

Enclor. 3/

Subject.

Forwarding the original petition of the 5th December 1892 from H. Asott B. Rungia Kaidi No: 188 and submit his report thereon.

For as understood what he means by saying that he got another letter suspending for giving his explanation. The copy is attached to the appeal - there is a mark humbly that it should have been taken into account as in petition and another letter's suspension has been considered for that.

WITH ORDER

to not appear from the record.

Hue.

Order 27-2-93 N. 2376

The petitioner will be informed that the Govt. declines to interfere with the orders passed in his case by the Surgeon General.

Petitioner 12 Ruels
copy to the Surg. Gen. 1/2
Notes. 1/2
24 Feb.

It is submitted that considering his offence the margin off very lightly.

J. D. B.

21/2

The value of the papers connected to the current have no bearing on the case & relate to complaints made by certain Municipal Council against petition in 1898 when he was arrested. The petitioners' names are not to be included but he applies against his suspension for months for being drunk & is indebted to the District Judge.

The facts are stated in the letter dated 25 March 93. The case rests on his explanation as to why he did not appear that any of them present on the occasion were ~~not~~ called up to give statements. There is no reason known to me the truth of the report and the petitioner has showed them to the Magistrate before applying

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 18

FURTHER PAPER, No.

OF 18

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED 18, No. MISCELLANEOUS.

ENCLOSURE

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT.

A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL (not paged).

N.B.-

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.

Government. These papers submitted at the time do not bear out the statement now made in the petition.

4. On receipt of the above correspondence Proceedings No: 2307 (copy enclosed) dated the 29th April 1889 were issued from this Office. In these Proceedings the charges brought against the Hsepl: Assistant are clearly laid down and a copy of the same was duly communicated to the District Surgeon and the Chairman Municipal Council.

5. It will be seen from the petition now submitted that the H^osp^l: Assistant carried out the orders contained in the Proceedings, as regards the tendering of an apology to Dr. Carruthers - so that he was made aware of the contents of the Proceedings and his statement therefore that "he does not know till now for what follies he was punished" is not true.

6. The Statement of the Hospital Assistant that he went to Dr. Carruthers' house to consult him regarding the treatment of his child seems to have been an after thought - vide para 3 of Dr. Carruthers' letter to the Chairman that Assistant Surgeon Hadden who was subsequently called on by the Hospital Assistant to see his child informed the Medical Officer that "Although the child was stated to have passed 10 motions he was not prepared

"prepared to believe it, as the child
"appeared to be perfectly well."

71 The Hospital assistant has no grounds whatever for a reconsideration of his case, since nothing in his present petition alters the facts of the case as detailed by Dr. Carruthers at the time on account of which the Hospital Assistant was punished.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Yours most obedt. Servant.

W. Lee Fulkcrand

S. M. General
Surgeon General
with the Govt: of Madras



reported by the District Surgeon.

I have seen

(Signed) G. L. Narasimham
Chairman

(2 enclos)

W. F. De Fabeck

S. M. Genl.
Surgeon General
with the Govt. of Madras.

11

OFFICE OF SURGEON-GENERAL

WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

Madras, 16 February 1893.

No. 164

From

SURGEON MAJOR-GENERAL W. F. DEFABECK, M.P.,

SURGEON-GENERAL WITH THE

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS,

Madras,

To

THE Chief Secy. to Government
Public Department,

SIR,

In returning your endorsement no: 12 dated the 10th January 1893, I have the honor to forward the original petition of 2^d class Hospital Assistant B. Rungiah Naidu no: 188 dated the 5th December 1892 together with the covering letter from the District Surgeon Kistna.

2. The petition contains several references to incidents which occurred prior to 1889 and which have no bearing on the question at issue.

3. In 1889 this Hospl. Assistant was reported by the District Surgeon Rajahmundry (Surgeon Major Carruthers) to the Chairman Municipal Council for drunkenness on duty and gross insubordination. A copy of the District Surgeon's report and of the covering letter from the Chairman are herewith enclosed for the information of Government.

shown that he has no idea of discipline, or of the respect due by a subordinate to his Senior Officer. He must be made to understand that such conduct as he has displayed in the present instance will meet with most severe punishment. The Surgeon General trusts that the present warning will be of service to him for the remaining portion of his service.

3. Asst. Asst. Rungiah Naidu is suspended from rank and pay for one month from date of relief and removed from his present appointment. He will be severely censured by the District Surgeon and a note made in his Service Book accordingly and he will be required to offer an ample apology to Surgeon Carruthers, which will be forwarded for the inspection of the Surgeon General. On expiration of his period of suspension he will proceed to Berhampore and report himself for general duty to the District Surgeon.

(True Extract)

(Signed) C. M. Thompson M.B.
Surgeon
Deputy Surgeon General
with the Govt. of Madras

(True copy)

J. M. S. M. Gent.
M. S. M. Gent.

No: 14.

From

Muzil: Office, Rajahmundry.

Dated 15th April 1889.

M. R. R. G. L. Narasimhaiah B. A.,
Rao Bahadur, Chaitanyam

L. Municipal Council, Rajahmundry.

G. Bidie Esq. M.B., C. I. B.

Surgeon General with

the Govt. of Madras.

Sir,

During your recent visit to this place, I represented to you the desirability of transferring the Asst. Asst. B. Rungiah Naidu from the Municipal Hospital. I have the honor now to enclose a copy of the resolution of the Council no: 1 dated 5th March 1889, on the same subject and request you will be pleased to comply with the wishes of the Council -

2. Subsequent to the passing of the resolution, Dr. Carruthers one day found the Hospital Assistant drunk at the Hospital and suspended him and wrote to me the enclosed letter in original (the returned)

3. I leave it to you to inflict on the Hospital Assistant any punishment you deem fit for having acted in an unseemly and grossly insubordinate manner as reported

th himself into my room and on my again declining to speak to him was grossly impertinent and insubordinate. He then stated that his child was ill, that he had come to consult me, that ^{as} I refused to see him he would leave; and accordingly did so. Now had he said at Hospital that his child was ill, and that he had been up all night, I should have had no more to say.

3. He subsequently went to Asst. Surgeon Hadden who called over and saw the child, and he informs me that although the child was stated to have passed ten motions he was not prepared to believe it, as the child appeared to be perfectly well.

On my calling Mr. Hadden's attention to Rangiah Naidu's condition he arrived at the same opinion as myself, namely that the man was drunk.

Under the circumstances I have for the present suspended the man, and placed the Asst. Surgeon in charge, and shall be glad to hear at an early date what steps the Council propose to take in the matter.

Chambers
(By) H. H. C. Carruthers, Surgeon
Dist. Surgeon

J. M. Hadden
S. M. Genl.

Surgeon-General & Govt.

no: 2307.

Proceedings of the Surgeon General with Govt. of Madras dated 29th April 1889.

Read letter no: 14 of 15th April 1889 with its annexures from the Chairman Municipal Council Rajahmundry recommending the removal of 2^d class Hospl. Assistant Rangiah Naidu no: 188 from the Municipal Dispensary.

Order thereon

From the foregoing papers it appears that Hospl. Asst. Rangiah Naidu was absent from the Hospital during the District Surgeon's visit on the 23^d March last; that he was afterwards found drunk and incapable of discharging his duty; that he subsequently went over to the house of the District Surgeon and behaved in a grossly impertinent and insubordinate manner.

2. The Surgeon General from a careful consideration of the above read papers considers that Hospl. Asst. Rangiah Naidu has been guilty of a most serious offence in having appeared drunk on duty and that by his conduct and behaving he has

(Enc copy)

W. G. Subrahmaniam
S. M. Gent.

Surgeon General
with the Govt. of Madras

20

No: 55

From.

Office of District Surgeon Godavari
Rajahmundry 25th March 1887

Surgeon H. St. C. Carothers

Dist. Medl. S. Surg. Officer

Rajahmundry.

To

The Chairman

Municipal Council,

Rajahmundry.

Sir,

I have the honor to bring to your notice for the information of the Council that on Saturday 23rd instant, during my visit to the Dispensary I missed the Asst. Rangiah Naik, and was informed that "He was here a short while ago" Some time afterwards in going round the wards he appeared looking dazed and foolish, and I asked him if he had been drinking. He denied this. A few minutes later I had occasion to operate on a patient and though leaning against the table he was unable to assist me, and the compounder did so. I took no notice of the matter at the time considering it useless to do so.

2. Shortly after my return home Rangiah Naik sent in word that he wished to see me, and I knowing the state he must be in, and feeling that no good could come of the interview, sent out word that I was busy and not able to see him - On this he forced himself

M

From

B. Rangayya - Naidu,
Hospital Assistant,
Rajamundry.

No. 1088

Transferred to the Public
Department.14/12/92
Fort St George
21 December 1892

Ag. Secy.

On 10 January 1893 No. 12
Forwarded to the Surgeon
General with the re-
quest that the original
petition of the 5th Dec.
'92 may be submitted
with a report.Calcutta
Ag. Secy.J.B.
2.1.93.Dated 5th }
Received 7th } December 1892.
Days in Public 22nd
Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Petition.

Stating that the petitioner was
punished for no fault by the
Departmental superiors, and
praying that the Government
may require the Departmental
heads to forward his petition
to the Government, and to
give ^{him} copies of the charges to the
petitioner.

(with an endorsement)

To The Public Department.

Ag. Secy.

Pros: of the Muni. Council Rajamundry
at their meeting held on the 5th March 1889.

1. Read letters 1. from Messrs S. Gopalakrishnaiah,
W. R. Arasaratnam, K. Ganga Raja, N. Kanna
Raj and S. Hanumantha Rao. 2 from K. Viresa-
lingam with copy of letter to Mr. D. Rangiah
Naidu, Asst. Assistant by Messrs N. Subba-
+ao Puntulu B.A. B.L. M.V. Subbaram Naidu B.A.
and N. Chelana. Dyogaon B.A. + B.L. regarding
the conduct of the Asst. Assistant towards Mr.
K. Viresalingam at a Singing party and the
District Surgeon's letter thereon no. 42 of the
19th February 1889.

The Council regret they could not take
notice of the Asst. Assistant's private con-
duct. As however it is certain that
Rangiah Naidu is very unpopular in the
town the Council take this opportunity to
resolve that the Surgeon General be
requested to remove him at the earliest
opportunity and appoint a competent
man (1st class Asst. Assistant if possible) in
his place.

(True copy)

(Signed) G. L. Narasimham

Chairman

lector, Mr. Moberly. (True copies of their letters to the Chairman marked E., F. and G. hereto annexed.)

9. That Mr. Y. L. Narasimham wrote a letter to the District Surgeon (Dr. Curruthurs) requesting him to inform me to withdraw the statements made by me in my explanation regarding the vaccination work (vide his letter No. 460 dated 12th marked G.) which are:—

(a) That he recommended his brother to me to be given 2nd Class Vaccinator's post on Rs. 10 that the Doctor having appointed him a probationer on Rs. 5, he, Mr. Y. L. Narasimham actually fought with me and bore grudge against me thinking that I did not willingly get him that post.

(b) That I attended several cases in his house and demanded fees for my service which he never paid.

10. That the above letter No. 460 having been shown to Mr. Moberly he immediately wrote to Dr. Curruthurs (the District Surgeon) and to Mr. Y. L. Narasimham (the Chairman) informing them, that the charges brought against the petitioner were decided in his favour once for all and that they ought not to be reopened by them and that the counter charges brought by the petitioner against Mr. Y. L. Narasimham by me are to be tried for which an explanation has been called for, which explanation he never submitted till now. (Vide letter No. 375 dated 17th December 1888.) *marked G.*

11. That in spite of the orders of Mr. Moberly (the Sub-Collector) Doctor Curruthurs, for reasons best known to himself, reopened the subject and went so far as to advise or hint to Mr. Y. L. Narasimham in a public letter dated 14th February 1889 to explain, himself in this manner marked H.

(a) That the services rendered by me in his house is of a personal moment and that it may be left out of the question. Mr. Y. L. Narasimham never gave any explanation for the questions asked by Mr. Moberly.

12. That Doctor Curruthurs with the inward motive of putting me to troubles dissuaded me to petition the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras though I strongly protested against it and never thought of it; and that when I drew up a petition putting forth all my grievances and praying for favorable orders he (the District Surgeon) made corrections in the petition according to his will and motives in his ownhand (which I still have with me) and believing that his advice may be bonafide, I sent the petition to the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras who gave an endorsement saying that my petition is uncalled for and that the charges having been decided in my favour I had nothing to petition them. The corrected petition will be produced before any *public authority* in person, because my petition addressed to your honor dated 19th February 1892 and the original documents attached thereto sent in a registered cover though acknowledged by the Assistant Surgeon Kistna seem to have been mislaid or thrown into oblivion.

13. That from the foregoing facts there can be no doubt that when Dr. Curruthurs came to Rajamundry as the District Surgeon the Municipal Councillors at the instigation of Mr. K. Veerasalingam tried hard to poison his mind against your humble petitioner.

14. (a) That the Municipal Councillors at the instigation of Messrs K. Veerasalingam and Y. L. Narasimham determined to ruin my prospects. (b) That his mother's recent death. (c) That Doctor Curruthurs' roused ill feelings in the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras against me. (d) That Dr. Curruthurs reopened the charges which Mr.

Moberly decided in my favour. (e) That my child being at the time very bad; all these having troubled my heart very much, I had to cry in the office in a lonely place for which Dr. Curruthurs unjustly charged me with drunkenness and when I tried to explain this in writing he brought against me an additional charge of impertinence and insubordination.

15. That I petitioned the Government on 5th October 1891 for redress and the Duplicate Copy was submitted through proper channel. The Government returned the petition with an endorsement No. 2957 of 19th October 1891 that the petition should be submitted through proper channel and the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras, returned the petition stating that I was punished for drunkenness and impertinence, by the District Surgeon Rajamundry and stated that as the petition contains statements not in accordance with facts the petition could not be forwarded to the Government. As the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras stated that the statements of my petition are not in accordance with facts, I submitted a petition proving the same by means of original documents and enclosed in it your original endorsement No. 2957 of 19th October 1891, and submitted it on 19th February 1892 but I could not get any reply till now.

16. That your petitioner's character has never been impugned during the 11 years he was Hospital Assistant in Rajamundry and the certificates of his Superior Officers show that they had naught to say against him and in fact were pleased with his services (copy of certificates marked I is hereto annexed).

17. That his mother's death was owing to the refusal of the privilege leave by the Municipal Council owing to the ill-feelings of the two above named Municipal Councillors for change of Climate to his mother as advised by Dr. Beech who also recommended the leave. That his child's death was owing to want of medical aid in as much as Doctor Hadden the Assistant Surgeon who first came and saw the child refused to treat the child at the dissuasion of Dr. Curruthurs though I offered him proper fees. Subsequently Dr. Curruthurs being solicited to treat the child replied in a harsh tone that neither he nor the Assistant Surgeon are supposed to treat the Medical Subordinates or their families and that it lies in their pleasure to do or not.

18. For Dr. Curruthurs neglecting to treat my daughter the Government may take what steps it thinks fit. I beg to state that the Departmental enquiry will not bring the truth into light and request that the Honorable Government will order judicial enquiry to be taken for the ends of justice, as two deaths occurred owing to malice entertained against me and for want of medical treatment. I finally pray that my former place at Rajamundry may be given me by cancelling the order of the Surgeon-General with the Government of Madras dated 23rd May 1889.

For which act of justice and kindness, your humble petitioner shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

He begs to remain,

Most respected Sir,

Your most obedient and humble servant,

Chattapully
5th December 1892

B. Narayana
23rd Class Hospital Assistant

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

*The humble representation of B. Rangayya Naidu,
Hospital Assistant at Rajamundry, at present in
Medical charge of the Local Fund Dispensary at
Challapalli in the Kistna District.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

1. That your petitioner had been Hospital Assistant at Rajamundry for 11 years from 1878 to 1889.
2. That when your petitioner was a Market Inspector at Rajamundry in 1883 on a pay of Rs. 15 Mr. K. Veeresalingam and Mr. C. Nagoji Row, Municipal Commissioners of the town, pressed him to resign his appointment in order to give the post to one Ramayya, a pensioned first class Hospital Assistant, who was their private physician; and, on his refusing to do so, they reduced his salary to Rs. 10.
3. That when he resigned the post, it was given to one Gurayya, a pensioned Hospital Assistant on a salary of Rs. 20.
4. That Mr. K. Veeresalingam a Municipal Councillor at Rajamundry, in a Local paper called Viveka Vardhani published in the issue of the 25th February 1885 a defamatory article charging your petitioner with mis-appropriating Municipal funds (A copy of the paper marked A and an English translation of it marked B are hereto annexed.)
5. That Mr. K. Veeresalingam went to the Hospital on the 19th March 1885 and asked for the diet book which included the tender for Hospital supplies (The tender in original was annexed to my petition dated the 19th February 1892.)
6. That your petitioner, who was intending to prosecute the said Mr. K. Veeresalingam for the defamation mentioned in para 4 suspecting that Mr. K. Veeresalingam might tamper with the book and thus take away the proof positive of the fact that there was no misappropriation alluded to in para 4 (the tender being at 2 annas the lb of coal tar which amounts to about Rs. 3 a maund, the sum actually charged by your humble petitioner) refused to let him have the book.
7. That some passage at arms followed between Mr. K. Veeresalingam and your petitioner, and the dispute, after some correspondence between the Civil Surgeon and the Chairman of the Municipality was finally decided by the Surgeon General with the Government, who ordered your petitioner to tender an apology for preventing Mr. K. Veeresalingam from doing what he had a right to do as a Municipal Commissioner (A true copy of the Surgeon General's Proceedings No. 2216 dated 1st May 1885 marked D is herewith annexed.)
8. That since then in 1888, there was some correspondence between the Civil Surgeon and the Municipality of Rajamundry about compulsory vaccination, and in connection with this compulsory vaccination the Municipal Councillors, Mr. K. Veeresalingam and Y. L. Narasimham being the chief of them, charged your petitioner with several unfounded accusations, but your petitioner was acquitted on all of them by the Civil Surgeon and the then Sub-Col-

To

THE CHIEF SECRETARY

TO THE GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

*The humble petition of B. Rangayya Naidu, Hospital
Assistant at Rajamundry, at present in Medical
charge of the Local Fund Dispensary at Chal-
lapalli in the Kistna District.*

MOST RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

1. That the petitioner was unjustly punished by the Departmental Superiors in six ways for no fault, viz.

- (a) One month's suspension without taking explanation to the surprise of the petitioner.
- (b) Tendering apology with explanation without knowing the cause.
- (c) Another month's suspension for giving explanation.
- (d) Death of a child without treatment.
- (e) Transfer on general duty to malarious and distant quarters for short intervals.
- (f) Loss of prospects and privilege leave.

2. That the petitioner during the last 3 years applied on 4 (four) occasions for copies of charges brought against him from which he was kept aloof which were not granted. He does not know till now for what follies he was punished.

3. That the Surgeon General with the Government of Madras punished the petitioner without taking any explanation from him, on the bare statements of Dr. Curruthurs which statements the petitioner does not know till now.

4. That he can prove the facts contained in his representation attached hereto dated 5th December 1892

5. That the District Surgeons of Vizagapatam and Kistna refused to forward his petitions.

6. That one death occurred owing to the want of treatment and malice borne against the petitioner by the District Surgeon of Rajamundry (Dr. Curruthurs) on account of the instigation of two Municipal Councillors and one death occurred as Municipal Council unjustly refused him privilege leave, though entitled, at the instigation of the above two Councillors.

7. That your petitioner submitted a copy of the accompanying representation dated 5th December 1892 through the proper channel which, he is afraid, will be returned to him as usual, so he prays that the Departmental Heads may be required to forward the petition to your grace. He therefore prays that the Honorable Government will kindly undertake to order judicial enquiry and to order that copies of charges should be given to the petitioner.

For which act of justice and kindness, your humble petitioner shall, as in duty bound, ever pray.

He begs to remain,

Most Respected Sir,

Your most obedient and humble servant,

Challapally
5th December 1892

B. Rangayya Naidu
Hospital Assistant