cal & Munl. (1895) Department.

MISCELLANEOUS.

G.O., No. 1057 L.

DATED 20th June 1895

[**Despatch Abstract.**]

Establishment.

Directing, with remark, the President, District Board, Nellore, to advertise the vacancy of the office of the Local Fund Engineer and approving the temporary arrangements proposed.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

9a

Proceedings of the President, District Board
dated 15th November 1894.

× × × × × × × × × × × × × × ×

The District Board Engineer has surpassed himself i evasiveness in his letter No $\frac{2113}{D.W.}$ dated 5th November 18 A bill for Rs 2470-7-6 was received in the office of the Engineer from the Sub Divisional officer, Ongole on the 1st April 1894. It was for work done on the Ongole Kottapatam Road without a sanctioned estima and without the authority of the President (Amende rule 69). No action was taken by him for $3\frac{1}{2}$ month and eventually in the Engineer's letter No. $\frac{1244}{L.W.}$ dated 17th October 1894, para 5, the Engineer said that the Sub Divisional officer's statement that the work was done on the Engineer's verbal orders was "ridiculous" but promised a further report. He was told this further report was awaited as the matter was serious. He has now not only ignored his promise of a further explanation, but in the explanation sent has completely ignored the direct conflict of statement between himself and the Sub Divisional officer, which is the point I have to deal with, and wishes me to believe the very improbable theory that the Contractor worked without order. If that is so, the Sub Divisional officer in his letter No. 268 dated 11th October 1894 has told two untruths (1st) that the Engineer

ve him verbal orders (2nd) that he (Sub Divisional
fficer) communicated those orders to the contractor.
Moreover to do work on an estimate without orders,
the contractor must have got hold of the estimate.
Not a word of explanation is given on either of these
all important points.

2. The matter cannot rest as it is and the Sub Divi-
sional officer must be told of the serious charge
which the Engineer makes against him and his
explanation must be forwarded with the Engineer's
remarks and his own explanation (if he adheres to his
theory) of how and why the contractor got hold of
the estimate to work on.

3. In the latter part of Section 2 of the first portion
of his letter, the Engineer makes the disingenuous
suggestion that he objected to pass the work on 20th
July 1894. because it had been done without orders,
whereas the refusal to pass was based on the quality of
the work and not at all on the irregularity of its being
done without sanction. This disingenuous suggestion
is carried further in the next paragraph in which it
is suggested that my predecessor approved of the
refusal to pass the work on the ground of this
irregularity, whereas all that Mr. Maclean did was
to approve of the preparation of a revised estimate.

4. What adds to the great seriousness of this matter is
that three estimates were being worked on in the same
year, two of which for the same kind of work on

---

the Engineers, offic

almost the same miles of the same road. This
most irregular and contrary to orders and as
gives greater facility for fraud through the billing
and over again for the same work. Such extraordin
irregularities in respect of so large a sum (nearly Rs 2
call for the utmost scrutiny and deserve the stronges
reprobation. Even if the Engineer's present theory were
the whole case is so bad and discloses so much irregu
and disorganisation that it would afford sufficient gr
for his removal.

5. With regard to the remark about litigation, it is o
that under amended rule 6, it is he that is personally re
ponsible for this unauthorized expenditure and therefo
for the costs of any consequent litigation.

6. Finally with respect to the last para of his letter there
should be nothing whatever to puzzle him. Under amend
rule 2, the Engineer is completely under the orders of the
President, District Board and this is a matter connected wi
the personal conduct of himself and his Sub Divisional off
It is because of his subordination to President, District
Board and of his independence of Taluq Board Presidents
correspondence between him and the latter pass through t
former. He should reply separately if he has not already
done so to Ongole Taluq Board President's No. $\frac{644}{D.T.B}$ d/ 20th Sept.

7. The Engineer is directed to number the paragraphs of his letter

Sd/ S. H. Wynne.
President.

Copy to President Taluq Board, Ongole, with reference of No. 975 dated 24th October 1894. The bill referred to ~ to work claimed to have been done by K. Narayanasamy on the Angole Kottapatam Road, on an unsanctioned mate without proper authority and without an agreement President District Board is dealing with the conduct the officers. The question of payment of the bill &c rests the Taluq Board.

(Sd/ S. H. Wynne
President.

(True Copy)

Mhr Avedanlaje
President

Copied by Kg
Compd by

---

given to the Contractor in his; the Engineer's, office

Note for the Collector and President.

This file relates to Bill No. 25 of 15th February 1894 in favor of K. Narayanasamy Pillay for work done in 1893-94 on Angole Kottapatam Road, sent for pre-audit.

2. For a bill to be audited, there must be a sanctioned estimate and agreement. On going into the papers for the estimate, it was found that no estimate was sanctioned for the work (vide also T. B Resolution on the Subject). The question then arises as to how the Contractor came to do the work when there was no estimate sanctioned or agreement taken.

In Ref, No $\frac{2113}{L.W}$ dated 5th November 1894, the Engineer had stated that the Sub Division officer Mr. Arbuthnot with the best intentions allowed the work to go on (although the Sub Division officer appears to have said in his No. 268 dated 11th October 1894, that the work was done under the verbal orders of the Engineer which were communicated by him to the contractor) and that the Contractor had at his own risk done the work without orders from his (Engineer's) office. In No $\frac{2118}{D.B}$ dated 15th November 1894, the Collector and President drew the attention of the Engineer to these conflicting statements of the two officers and asked [illegible]

The Sub Division officer explained in his No $\frac{1554545}{S.D.O}$ dated 6th December 1894 that the Engineer" instructed "him to proceed with the work up to the 6th Mile to "about half of the extent of the estimate, that he prepared "and submitted on 16th August 1893 an estimate for Rs 7700 "which was modified in October 1893 to Rs 5000 in the "Engineer's office, that he informed the contracter of the "Estimate ordered for Rs 5000 and of the Engineer's "instructions to proceed with work up to the 6th mile "to about half the extent of Estimate in anticipation "of sanction, but that he never gave the contractor "a copy of the estimate, that the contracter came with "a copy of the estimate from the Head office (Engineer's office) "without proper authority, that if he had not received "such instructions from the Engineer he would have "frustrated the contractor in this Special work.

In submitting a copy of this explanation the Engineer stated that " if verbal orders had been given by him "to the Sub Divisional officer as asserted by him, he (the Engineer) "would not have put up for President's approval certain "drafts returning agreement &c, that to avoid litigation "he recommended that payment might be made for work "actually executed and measured by the overseer in charge "of the work and checkmeasured by the Sub Divisional officer, "that the Sub Divisione officer with the best intentions "had probably allowed work to go on, that estimates &c were not given to the Contractor in his; the Engineer's, office, "as stated by the Sub Division officer, that the Contractor "had stated that the Estimates were given to him in the "Ongole Sub Division office and that these estimates "probably "F" and "H" are in the hand writing of a "maistry and the Head Clerk of the Ongole Sub Division office".

The Maistry and the Head Clerk do not appear to have been called upon to explain this irregularity of the manner in which the documents prepared in their writing had been in the possession of the contractor.

In Proceedings No $\frac{194}{D.B}$ dated 11th February 1895, the Collector and President, after perusing these papers came to the conclusion that in as much as the Engineer inspected and noticed, as admitted by him, that the work was being done without sanction and yet did not report the matter, this was sufficient evidence in support of the Sub Divisional officer's allegation.

The Taluq Board of Ongole has eventually sanctioned the payment of the bill with the following remarks.

× × × × × × × × × × × × ×

"At the same time the Board desires to place on record "its unqualified disapproval of the conduct of the Engineer, "Establishment in ordering or permitting work to be carried "out before the estimate had been sanctioned" vide Taluq Board Resolution No. 227 of 1st March 1895.

3. While sanctioning the payment of the bill with the above remarks, the Taluq Board desired that the bill should be *audited*, and in forwarding a copy of this Resolution to the District Board Engineer, the Taluq Board President requested that the bill might be *pre-audited* and the party paid. He forwarded also a copy of a memo prepared in his office pointing out the discrepancies in the maintenance estimate of that year as compared with the present estimate (draft) submitted but not sanctioned.

4. The bill with the above two documents was received in the District Board Engineer's office on the 22nd March 1895, but without sending the same for pre-audit as desired by the Taluq Board, a cheque was drawn by the Engineer on 31st March 1895.

5. On the 8th of April 1895 however, the District Board Engineer addressed the Treasury Deputy Collector to say that the word "Pre-audit" contained in the Taluq Board President's letter was not noticed in his office by oversight (he does not say who is responsible for it), that a cheque was drawn and that the bill might be returned to him after audit. The utter disregard of the requisition of the Taluq Board President and the explanation that this was due to oversight in his office require serious notice.

It should be added that last year, a cheque in favor of P. Bala Krishna Pillay for another work was delivered to him in the Engineer's office without taking his signature on the bill and the expenditure had to be admitted in the Accounts without a proper voucher under the special sanction of the late president.

6. Going into the details of the bill, it would appear that this bill refers to one of the three estimates which were being simultaneously worked out on the road in 1893-94, the other two however under competent sanction, with almost the same sub heads of work in all the estimates. It is presumed that these materials do not refer to any of the other two estimates. According to the dates in the measurement sheet, the overseer certifies to have measured the Collection of materials on 3rd and 30th October 1893 and 9th February 1894, also the Sub Divisional officer certifies to have Check-measured the same on 3rd and 30th October 1893 while the × measurement book shows that both the overseer and the Sub Divisional officer measured and Checkmeasured both Collection and Spreading on the same date, that is, the 9th February 1894.

No 1 of 1892-93
ages 14-22

From this it would appear that the Collection of materials was measured and Check-measured on spreading, which is most irregular and impossible and is not allowable. Nay, it is more suspicious.

The whole work appears to have been measured by the overseer and Checkmeasured by the Sub Divisional officer on the same date viz 9th February!

3.

e entries in the measurement book have not been scored through in red ink and bill number &c quoted as required in note 1 in the measurement book to prevent the issue of a 2nd bill for the same measurements.

7. The following differences appear between the measurement-sheet and the bill with regard to quantities.

Mile	According to the Measurement Sheet		According to the bill	
	Metal spread	Road picking	Metal spread	Road picking
1st	33 1/2	115 1/4	36 1/2	146
3d	—	282 1/2	—	285

of P. Balan

The difference in the quantity of materials spread may perhaps be explained to be due to the approximate thickness of the layer spread; but there should be no difference in the squares of road picking (i.e.) the surface of the talks spread.

8. The next question is about rates. There being no sanctioned estimate, the Taluq Board President passed some of the items in the bill, so far as they tallied, at rates in the maintenance estimate.- - - - - - - -

of the road for that year; but there are several other items in this Bill which are ~~not tbe~~ not to be found in the Maintenance estimate of that year. For a few of Such cases the Taluq Board President has adopted the rates in the draft estimate submitted, which covers up the bill, but which estimate was not sanctioned. Even going upon these data, the following points require special orders.

(a) 4th Mile Earth work:—

According to the measurement Sheet this earthwork was intended for excavating side channels. The rate for this work including sectioning with 3 feet berms is — Rs 0-3-9 a unit and not 0-4-0 as billed for. (vide item No. 5 of the Schedule of rates).

(b) 3rd Mile Quartz Metal Collection.

This was not provided for in the maintenance estimate of the road for that year. In the draft Special Repair Estimate according to which this bill was prepared a cartage of 4 miles is allowed; the road metal rate ×book obtained now from the Engineer's office shows for this mile a cartage of only 3 miles. The cost of carriage is however for 4 miles. It has therefore to be decided — whether the cartage or its cost is correct. It is true that there are several corrections in this book in the cartage and cost which are attested by the Engineer but these do not enable anybody to know when

× Page 6

Dis No $\frac{1051}{L.W}$ of 8th June 1893.

these Corrections were made. In the same yea to which this bill relates, another ×estimate for th Special Repairs of this road (4th Mile) was sanctione and worked out. This provides 4 miles cartage fo the 4th Mile and the contractor was accordingly paid. The cartage for the 3rd Mile Should therefore be 3 miles as per entry ~~of~~ in the Road Metal ~~Rate~~ book which is not corrected. In the present bill however the overseer has included the difference of rate f the 4th Mile worked out according to a separate estimate. The Taluq Board disallowed this item — with a remark that if there had been a mistake — (in the sanctioned estimate), the extra amount due if any should be drawn on a separate bill. Orders are requested what cartage is to be allowed in this case. The cartage for 5th & 6th Miles also depends on this.

(c) 2nd Mile Quartz Metal Collection

In the Taluq Board President's Memo it is said that the rate in the ordinary maintenance Estimate of the road for that year is to be allowed in the bill. In that estimate no metal was provided for - but only gravel. It was therefore a mistake in the Taluq Board's office to allow the less rates of gravel for metal and the Engineer without explaining this reduces his bill accordingly.

(d) In all other cases in which the Taluq Board President's Memo specified any rates to be allowed for any mile, such instructions have been taken for guidance.

) The sanctioned schedule of rates does not furnish ny rates for carting sand. The Engineer has allowed or this work the rate sanctioned for carting laterite metal and gravel.

) So also for spreading the sand. A rate of two Annas unit is billed for (adopting the rate of top-dressing or sand spreading). The corrections in the Road metal Statement have not been attested by the Engineer. Pending orders of the President the bill as not been corrected. The results of these remarks will be communicated to the Engineer on receipt of orders from the President.

(Initialled) B. S. R.
T. D. C.
30-4-95

(True Copy)

Copied by
Camp. Int

Manavedan Raja
President.

1268 L/95

NELLORE COLLECTOR'S OFFICE.

No. 591/D.B

1st May 1895.

Despd 2nd May 1895

Local & [illegible]
CURRENT No.

1268 L

From K. C. Mānavedan Raja Esquire
~~Collector of Nellore.~~
President, District Board, Nellore

To the Chief Secretary to Government, Local and Municipal Department, Madr

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 645 L Mis dated 8th April 1895, declining to sanction the nomination of Mr P. Narry and directing the advertisement of the vacancy again, I have the honor to state that I shall advertise the vacancy if no one else out of the 37 applicants whose names have already been submitted to Government is deemed fit by the Government for the appointment.

will be found in
GO 20 L/9-1-95

2. I have no wish to find fresh charges against the late Engineer; but during my short experience here, I regret to state that I have been receiving papers almost every day clearly showing the deplorable confusion in which the Engineer's office and work are involved. The Inspector of Local Fund accounts in his audit report of the District has already brought to the notice of Government the various irregularities that he in his apparently cursory examination has found out. I meet with instances ~

GO 668 L/8-4-95

[Eng.; 6-2-95.]

almost everyday of works executed 20 or 30 months ago without estimates being prepared, without the sanction being obtained of the Local Boards concerned or without agreement being taken from Contractors. Things are being done in utter disregard of rules & orders. One such instance I beg to submit for the information of Government in the accompanying note from Treasury Deputy Collector and a copy of Proceedings passed by my predecessor. They refer to a work said to have been done in 1893-94 but not paid for up to date. It contains almost every form of irregularity that can possibly be committed if rules are disregarded. I do not exaggerate facts when I say that these papers would give Government a tolerably correct idea of the way in which things are done. I beg again to repeat that I refer to these circumstances with the only object of convincing the Government that the District Board requires at present the services of a strong officer with good professional attainments and thoroughly acquainted with the office routine and details of accounts and rules

3. In these circumstances, I would in the first place request that Government may be pleased to lend to the District Board for a period of at least a year or two the services of an officer of the Department of Public Works who may be considered competent and trustworthy. If this is not practicable, I would recommend for the appointment the names of Mr Subbaroya Chariar and R. W. Ward. Both are retired Government Servants and that circumstance is itself in my opinion a guarantee for the satisfactory discharge of duties. Mr Subbaroya Chariar appears to have been Executive Engineer of the 3rd grade. He seems to have been retired on technical grounds and no for reason of physical or other incapacity. I would prefe him to Mr. Ward who appears to have been only a Sub Divisional officer. Both of them appear to have been retired only last year and are still physically fit for further service. If Government is pleased to sanction my nomination, I shall take them on probation for six months and on the clear understanding that their servic will be dispensed with on their attaining the 55 years of age.

Requisition has been sent to the Pension department for the papers relating to the retirement of these officers.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient Servant

President

Copied by B

Comp'd Ind

From the Collector ~~of~~ & President District Board, Nellore.

Local & Municipal Dept.
Mrs CURRENT No. 1268 L

To The Chief Secretary to Government
Local & Municipal Department
Madras.

Dated 1st May 1895
3 MAY 95
No. 591 En. 2

Subject.

Submitting proposals for ~~the~~ filling up the vacancy of District Board Engineer rendered vacant by the removal of Mr C Scott ~~for sanction of Government~~.

To lie over pending receipt of Mr Scotts fresh appeal referred to in G. O. d/ 3rd May 1895 No 779 L

1R
8/5/95

C.G.
g.v.

[Eng.; 21-7-93.]

6/5 A 8/5

No. 758/D. B.

NELLORE COLLECTOR'S OFFICE.
Dated 4th June 1895.
Desp'd 6. June 1895

From H. C. Manavedu Raja Esquire
Ag. Collector & President District Board of Nellore.

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 1588 L

To the Chief Secretary to Government,
Local & Municipal Department, Madras.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No 639/D.B. dated 8 May 1895, I have the honor to request that Sanction of Government may be obtained for the Sub-Protem appointment of Mr. H. Arbuthnot Sub-Divisional officer, Ongole, as District Board Engineer, Nellore with effect from 17th April 1895. As it is inconvenient to get on with the work without a Sub-divisional officer, I recommend that J. Chinniah Moodaly 1st grade overseer on Rs 60 may be appointed as Sub-Protem Sub-divisional officer in place of Mr. H. Arbuthnot.

in G.O. 1014 L/14-6-95: in the linked file

× Salary Rs 200 -

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

~~Assistant~~ Deputy Collector
for President.

Copied by W
Comp'd by H

[Eng.; 6-2-95.]

1588L

From the Collector and President,

District Board, Nellore.

To The Chief Secretary to Government
Local & Municipal department,
Madras

Dated 4th June 1895
8 JUN. 95

No. 758/DB.

Subject.

Submitting proposals for the Sub Protem appointments of ~~the~~ Mr Arbuthnot as D. B. Engineer, ~~Wallace~~ & of T Chinniah Mudali as ~~the~~ Sub Divisional officer, Ongole & requesting the Sanction of Govt. for the Same

H M / Mis order

Sanctioned

V R
14/6/95

Note

The qualifications of Chinniah Mudali have not been reported but the appointment is only temporary. As regards Mr Arbuthnot's qualifications, please see C no 1120 L in GO of 3-5-95 no 779 L

To The Presdt. Dt. Bd. Nellore

[D. B. 22-12-92.] S. R. V. Press.

1416

[G./25.]
600—7-5-95.

L and M DEPARTMENT.

C. NoS 1268 L and 1588 L

Order 20/6/95 No. 1057 Luns

The President's proposal that a P.W.D. officer should be deputed to take charge of the Local Fund Engineer's office ~~cannot be~~ is out of the ~~approved~~ question ~~nor do either~~ and neither of his nominees for the Engineership appear to Government to be suitable. He should advertise the vacancy again.

2. The temporary arrangements proposed in the second of his letters read above are ~~sanctioned~~ approved.

(from orders)

18/6/95

Cgt
17.VI.

To
The President District Board
Nellore.

Desptd. 21/6/95

× Quite

FOR ORDERS.

Mr Scott's second appeal having been dismissed, the question of appointing a successor to him remains to be decided.

2. In his letter contained in G.O. no 20L/9.1.95 Mr Wynne submitted a list of 36 candidates who had replied to his advertisement of the vacancy. A Mr Thompson was first selected for the post and afterwards Mr Nery. The first has left the country and the latter was disapproved of by Government. In the G.O. declining to sanction his appointment (no 645L/5.IV.95) Government ordered the President to advertise the vacancy again.

3. C no 1268L contains Mr Manavedan Raja's reply to this order. He first suggests that an officer of the P.W.D. be lent to the District Board to put matters straight and secondly that in case this cannot be done one of the candidates whose names have already been submitted may be selected.

4. His first proposal seems to be out of the question.

5. As regards the second point he nominates two retired D.P.W. officers, M.R.Ry S. Subbaraya Sariar and Mr Ward, for the place.

6. The first was retired last year because "unfit for further promotion". He was a long time Executive Engineer at Negapatam and it is believed that a reference to Col: Pennycuick or to Mr Winterbotham or Mr Thomson, who both know him, would establish his total unfitness for the place.

7. Mr Ward is believed to be a better man and fit for the charge of a light district but it is much to be doubted if he could put Nellore to rights.

8. Orders are solicited as to whether the President may be told that neither of his nominations can be accepted and the former order to advertise again may be repeated.

9. I don't know if I might bring to H.M.'s notice in this connection that Mr Millie, no 20 in the list of applicants, who was a sub-divisional officer on the Máyavaram-Mutupet railway, is a thoroughly practical man and was very highly thought of by his superiors. He retired before his time was up on account of blindness in one of his eyes but has apparently taken up work again as a contractor. The President might perhaps be asked to see if he would not do.

10. In C. no 1588 L the President asks for sanction to the appointment of his subdivisional officer Mr Arbuthnot as sub pro tem. L.F. Engineer from the 14th April till a successor is appointed

FOR ORDERS.

I submit that this may be done.

17/6/95

This may be sanctioned as further delay is likely

[G./25.]
600-7-5-95.

DEPARTMENT.

C. No.

FOR ORDERS.

and for the promotion of an overseer to fill the Sub-divisional officer's place. There seems to be no objection to these temporary appointments unless ~~the~~ one of the nominations to the Engineership now submitted is approved, in which case the latter would be unnecessary, as the overseer does not appear to have taken charge.

15/6/95

15-vi

Appointment of a L.F. Engineer Nellore.

FOR ORDERS.

H.M.

10572

C.S.

(for orders)

97/6 [illegible]

When given for copying ______
When copied ______
When examined ______
When signed ______
} 189 .

READ AGAIN G.O., No. DATED 189 ,

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. 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.