

Public (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 260

DATED 8th April 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

V: RAGAVA ROW.

Declining to reconsider the order directing the removal of---
from his place as toll clerk of the Buckingham Canal Division Office.

AS

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	2274						

1895.

Public Works Department.

No. 1215 C
Dated 22-3-1895
Despatched
Received 2322

SUBJECT.

Transferring petition from V. Raghava Rao, late toll clerk of the Buckingham Canal &c. Office praying that he may be restored to his former post.

Pub. 826 D 2-11-94
Involuntary fit

Hon. H. W. Bliss. C. S. G.
Hon. J. Grose.

The petitioner prays for restoration. He was removed by G.O. 2-11-94, No. 826.

J.S.B. 26-3-95. Here is I submit no ground for a recommendation of the Com. If the Com. did not know that he had been removed he should have.

28/3/95 J.S.B.

Order of 8th Apr: 1895 No. 240

The Govt. is not prepared to modify G.O. 2-11-94, No. 826 from order.

J.S.B. 1-4-95.

To the P. W. Dept. 15th July.

Despd: only on 15th July. J.S.B.

No

The Honorable Col. John Pennycuik, R. E.,
Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Madras.

The humble petition of Raghavak
late Toll clerk of the Buckingham
Canal Division office,

Most Respectfully Sheweth,

That having been deeply aggrieved
with the order of the Government of Madras, No. 826,
dated 2nd November 1894, removing him from service
on a charge of recklessness in monetary transaction,
your humble petitioner begs most respectfully to lay
the following miserable circumstances of his case
for your honor's favourable consideration.

2 That your petitioner begs to state the whole
detail of the case has been submitted by the
Executive Engineer with his opinions.

3 That your petitioner is not aware whether any
money passed between Sivarama Rao and Ranga
natha Aiyer (clerks in the same office over 12 years)

and

and he knows nothing beyond his having countersigned the Pro Note. This, he was asked to do by Suroothama Row, (apparently at the pressure of Rungnatha Aiyer). Having been new to public life, and being induced by Suroothama Row for whom the petitioner had some respect to countersign, being also a relative, he did this without knowing the consequences of action, though he now sees that he had been extremely foolish. Suroothama Row died all on a sudden about 40 days after the execution of the Pro Note, having been suffering from some sort of mental aberration, even a few days before the transaction. Considering, that so large an amount as Rs 1000, stated to have been lent by Rungnatha Aiyer to Suroothama Row whose salary was only Rs 30 per mensem, and the unusually high rate of interest 30 percent., make him doubt the genuineness of the transaction.

4 That after the death of Suroothama Row, Rungnatha Aiyer troubled the petitioner for the liquidation of the debt, so much so, that he pressed him to withdraw the security Rs 100 deposited as a wharf clerk. The petitioner withdrew the amount and paid it to Rungnatha Aiyer
even

even without the knowledge of his parents. Rungnatha Aiyer having cleverly secured a hold against the petitioner, at once filed a suit against him and his father who was not even aware of the transaction, without proceeding against the deceased ~~brother~~ ~~and~~ ~~property~~. The Court ~~such~~ ~~decreed~~ ~~his~~ ~~father~~, ~~passed~~ ~~a~~ ~~decree~~ ~~against~~ ~~the~~ ~~petitioner~~ ~~on~~ ~~the~~ ~~ground~~ ~~of~~ ~~his~~ ~~having~~ ~~backed~~ ~~the~~ ~~Pro Note~~ ~~although~~ ~~the~~ ~~examination~~ ~~of~~ ~~Rungnatha Aiyer~~ ~~elicited~~ ~~information~~, ~~which~~ ~~rendered~~ ~~the~~ ~~honesty~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~transaction~~ ~~very~~ ~~doubtful~~. After obtaining a decree, he threatened to take Civil warrant against him.

5 That as the petitioner has no property now worth the name, except the salary which he had been receiving he had no other course open but to have recourse to the benefit of the Insolvent Act. Petitioner was not allowed the benefit of the act, as an allocation of Rs 100 per month from his pay was made with petitioner's consent. He had been paying that amount regularly until the date of his removal from service. He further begs to state that he has not incurred any kind of debt either on his own or on any other account and also he

is

is not under any such necessity or obligation.

That on the petitioner's application for the benefit of the Insolvent Act, the Executive Engineer, having submitted to Government his true and favourable opinion of the affair, as required in Para 43 of the "Rules regulating the personal conduct of Public Servants"; the Government considering the circumstances of the case was pleased to allow him to work in the office without being suspended, pending the adjudication of the Court (vide Chief Engineer's Memorandum, No 1983, dated 21st May 1894). Petitioner's conduct was viewed by the Executive Engineer as utterly foolish, and in this sense, he was warned. By these, the petitioner was confident that no further punishment will be inflicted on him by Government. To his great disappointment and dismay, he had been removed from service.

That by the foregoing facts, your honor will be convinced that the petitioner was not in any way reckless in his monetary transactions. It was solely due to an unforeseen circumstance, over which he could have no control, viz, the sudden death of Surothama Row. Further, in as much as he has been ordered by the Court,

to pay a small portion of his pay, he is not an Insolvent, so as to expose Government to any kind of risk.

8 That your humble petitioner is a Matriculate of 27 years of age, with a very long future before him. During the period of his 3 years service in the Buckingham canal Division office, he had spared no pains to give full satisfaction to his superiors in the discharge of his official duties.

9 That your humble petitioner further bears, government has recently delegated the power of disposing such cases to heads of departments.

10 That under these circumstances, your humble petitioner begs your honor to be graciously pleased to consider the foregoing facts, and order his restoration to his post. For which act of grace and favor, he shall ever feel grateful, especially considering, that the long future before him should become a deplorable one under the existing state of his unfortunate case.

And your honor's petitioner, as in duty bound shall ever pray.

The Petitioner

Sd/- 26 Hanumantha Royer,
civil strat

Triplicane
Madras

15th March 1895 }
Madras }

[Faint handwritten text, mostly illegible]

To 1215 Col/22nd March
1895

Transferred to the
Public Department

[Signature]
Col. No.

Secretary to Govt.
J.W.D.

[Faint handwritten text continues]

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATE:

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO O. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

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