

No. 1983C.

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated Madras, 21st May 1894.

Letter from the Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal Division No 206 dated 21st April 1894.—

In continuation of this office No. 2929 dated 14th ultimo, I have the honour to forward in original the accompanying letter, dated 19th Instant from clerk Raghava Row, requesting permission to return to duty, and ^{stating} that he has obtained a protection order from the Court.

2. I have given the clerk permission to return to duty, as in your memo No. 496 Bk dated 31st March 1894, para 3, you ordered that he was to be given leave.

3. The question whether the clerk is to be suspended should, apparently in the circumstances, be decided by the Chief Engineer under G.O. 472 W. dated 29th May 1891. My own opinion which, under para 43 of the Rules for personal conduct of Public Servants should be submitted, is that the suspension is unnecessary, the circumstances of the case having already been fully enquired into, and the clerk in my judgment being

para of my letter No 2929 dated 14th ultimo.

Endorsement thereon by the Superintending Engineer II Circle No. 5 to B.L. dated 9th May 1894:

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, P.W. Department with reference to his No. 13 D. dated 17th April 1894, for favour of orders.

2. In the circumstances stated by Mr. Russell, the undersigned recommends that the clerk V. Raghava Row be allowed to return to duty.

In the circumstances stated, the clerk need not be suspended pending orders of the Court on his application for the benefit of the Insolvent Act.

(Sd) J. Penmycuike Esq. R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.

1 True Copy

R. S. Gons.

Head Clerk P.W. Secretariat

4

4

3

3

4

Letter from A. S. Russell Esquire
Executive Engineer, Buckingham Canal
Du. to the Superintending Engineer, 2nd Circle,
dy Madras, 4th October 1894, No 1607

With reference to your endorsement No. 65 B.L. d. 25th May 1894 on Chief Engineer's Memo. No. 1983 d. 21st Idem, I have the honour to forward for final orders of Govt. copies of the following papers in connection with the insolvency of V. Raghava Row, a clerk of my office.

- (a) Insolvent's petition
- (b) — do — schedule
- (c) Discharge order
- (d) Votes of the Judge
- (e) Payment orders

2. As already stated, I am of opinion that the insolvency in this case was not the result of extravagance but of sheer foolishness. I therefore recommend the retention of the clerk in Government service, but I propose to transfer him from my office — elsewhere in the Division, as it is not desirable that he should continue to work side by side with me.

the other Clerk concerned in the transaction.

Enclor 5

No. 242 B.C.

13.10.94

Submitted to the Chief Engineer, P.W.D. with reference to his Memo. No. 1983 C dt 21st May 1894 for favor of final orders of Government - Vide Para 23, Chapter II, Volume I of Government of India Codes.

2. The undersigned supports the recommendation of the Executive Engineer.

W. B. Baidya Major R.E.

Sub Engineer

26. II Field.
12.10.94.

Pub. CURRENT NO. 3071
The Chief Engineer,
2nd Floor

To

The Chief Engineer,
P. W. D.
Madras

Encls: 5

Recs: 18-10-94
Dated 13 October/94.
Res: 222

Chief Secretary
Department of Public Works
Clark V. Raghunath
Papers in connection
with the insolvency
of - Forwarded - for
favor of final orders.

No. 3240 Cd/20-October
1894

Transferred to
the Public Department
2. A copy of the
Suptg. Engineer's
endorsement No.
56 B.C. d/9-May-1894
and of the Chief
Engineer's order thereon
No. 1983 C dated 21.5.94
idem is enclosed.

Subang I
Secy. to Govt.

The object of the rules as
transferring to Govt. Sec.
banks who become insolvent
is that Govt. may not be exposed
to the risk necessarily involved
by the retention in its service
of persons who are utterly
reckless in their dealings
with money. This seems
to be a distinct case of
such recklessness, and as
it is not disregarded if
the rules are to be maintained
in full force. The man
should not be retained in
the service

28/10/94

I agree. Public servant
can be allowed to continue
such obligations merely
because of relations ship

31/10

Insolvent Clerk V.
Raghava Row, P. W. D.
Pay 18/1. Debt 1067/1. The
result of signing a
pro. note for 1000/1. for
a "blood relation". To
pay 3/1. a month.
Insolvency stated to
be result of sheer fool-
ishness not extra-
vagance.
Retention record.

25/10/94
Under the circumstances the
recommendation of the C. & S. might
be sanctioned but it is at
the same time to be remarked
that the backing by a Clerk on
Rs. 18 a month of a bill for Rs.
1000 with interest at 30 per
cent savours somewhat of
recklessness.

25/10/94

Public Current 3071.

Order 82nd Nov 1894 No 826

The object of the rules regarding the suspension ^{and subsequent disposal} of Govt servants who become insolvent is that Govt: may not be exposed to the risk necessarily involved by the retention of persons who are utterly reckless in their monetary transactions.

2. The case of clerk V. Raghava Row shows that he was guilty of such recklessness that to permit his retention in service would be to totally disregard the rules referred to above. He ^{will be} accordingly ^{be deemed} ~~dis.~~ ^{dismissed} with effect from the date on which this order is received in the office in which he is serving.

W. Dept

DESPATCHED

6 NOV 94

Insolvent Clerk

Reminders

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 100

FORWARD PAPER, No.

990

OF 100

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

REMARKS: (To be filled in by the clerk)

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

[2
11]

ORDINARY, MS

Sub DEPARTMENT
G.O., DATED 2nd Nov 1894
No. 826

INDEXED.

When given for copying. 2/11
4.10.94

[Despatch Abstract.]

Meeting with Venkatesh
Rao. W. Raghunatha Rao,
Chief Executive Engineer,
Buckingham Canal
District who has been
detained on account
of removal from the
service.