

Public Works (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 959 R

DATED 11. Nov 1896

[Despatch Abstract.]

Suit Sanctioning the defence at the ex-
pense of Govt, of certain - filed by a clerk
against C. Mr W. J. Silekrish Eupmishy,
Assistant Mandal Railway Survey

Feb 11
F.W. 21
Law-23-10-96

19/11

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

ARSIKERI-MANGALORE RAILWAY SURVEY,

Dated *Bangalore* 23rd Oct 1896.

No. 901

To *The Consulting Engineer for Railways
Madras.*

From Engineer-in-Chief,
BANGALORE.

Sir.

I have the honour to report that on the 15th I received a summons from the District Judge's Court to appear and defend a case for Rs 63. 6. 6 on the 19th. The circumstances of the case are as follows. In May 1895 I served notice on all the clerical staff attached to the Divisional offices who were not likely to be required during the recess. On various representations from the Executive Engineers these men after notice were retained in order that they might be ready to take the field again and were given such work as could be found for them.

When in September they were called
on to go out, two men out of three
refused on fictitious pleas of health,
marriages of daughters & so on, and
I ordered their prompt dismissal
after giving them time to consider,
on the grounds that they had been
drawing pay as a retainer for future
service in the field. Since then several
letters have been sent me by lawyers to
which I replied and one man applied
to file a suit which the Court dis-
missed some months back without
my knowing anything about the matter.
As my departure drew near, with the
object, I suppose, of harassing me
into paying the claim to avoid the
inconvenience of detention, the suit was
filed on the 15th, admitted by the

S

Court and the case was heard on
the 19th. I felt that it must be defended
and I engaged the services of Mr. Hayes,
Barrister-at-Law, whose fee Rs 50/-
I paid. The judgement is deferred
and the case will I understand be
certainly dismissed, but in the meanwhile
I request that the expenditure incurred
be sanctioned.

I may perhaps state that this is
the first time in 26 years service that
I have ever been sued in my official
capacity.

I have the honour, Sir,

Sir

Your most obedient servant,

W. F. F. F.

S. E.
Engineer-in-Chief
Arsikere Mangalore Ry. Survey.

4654
23 10 96

23 OCT 1906

Form No. 21.
27-2-30.

OFFICE OF THE CONSULTING ENGINEER FOR RAILWAYS,
Madras, 23rd Oct 1896.

No. 3356

OFFICE NOTE.

Letter from the Agent, *Superintendent of Railway* (No. 906/10)
dated 22nd October 1896, forwarded to the Examiner of Railway
Accounts for *favor of remarks*.

[Signature]

for E. R.

EXAMINER'S REPLY.

No. 139 & dt 27-10-96

To E. R.

Please see P.W. Code volume I, chapter IV, para 16. This
appears to be a case in which the defence should be carried out
at the expense of Government.

Sanction
Wt 28/10

27/10/96

C.

[Signature]
27/10

No 959 D dated 11.11.96
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
RAILWAY BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Letter from the Eng-in
-Chief, Arriken Mangaloor by survey, No 901, dt 22. Oct 1896.

Sanction is
accorded to the rail being
defenced at the expense
of Government.

30/10

Eng. Amby
-Ex. P. W. acc'd
11.11.96

30/10

8