

Marine ^{1225, 1128} (1896) Department.

G.O., No. 606 *mar*

DATED 21st November 1896.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Demurrage: The charge for — claimed
by the Southern Mahratta Railway in
connection with the conveyance of
a 5 Ton Crane from Kopalpur to
Madras, sanctioned as proposed by
the Presy. Port Officer.

5/5

21/11

The charge for — claimed by the Southern Mahratta Railway in connection with the conveyance of a 5-ton crane from Gopalpur to Madras, sanctioned, as proposed by the Presidency Port Officer.

Marine

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 806 Marine of 21st November 1886.
PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Letter from the Presidency
Port Officer (H.E. No. 2/335 of Oct. 19. 1886)

do do do (H.E. No. 2/362 of Nov 10. ")

50

The charge for
demurrage is sanctioned
as proposed by the Presy.
Port Officer. The cost
will be met from Port
Funds.

The Presy Port Officer
" Accountant General

20/11/86

543 & dt 5th November 1896

Marine Dept.

Memo:

Letter from the Presidency Post office N^o 2/335-G dt 19-10-96.

806 ru

The undersigned is directed to request that the circumstances of this case may be more clearly explained for the information of Government. The route actually taken by the crane on its way to Madras should be given, ^{as well as the} ~~information~~ ^{forehand} portion of the journey, the sum of Rs 393-10-⁰⁰, sanctioned in G.O. 94. Marine dt 15 July: 96, was paid. If from Berhampore to Bezwada only, the charge seems to the Govt: to have been unduly high; and it is not understood why the freight for this portion of the route should have been paid to the Southern Mahratta Ry.

2. It is ^{moreover} not at all clear whether the amount claimed by the Southern

Marhatta Ry: on account
of demurrage has been
actually paid or not.

28/10/86
16

LS

Marine (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 1225

The Hon. Secy.

For Orders.

With reference to the Hon. From,
Memorandum dated 23/10/96.
The facts now can clear.

The Presidency Port Office,
Madras

No. 2/3629

16/11/86

LS - The payment in
must be sanctioned - The
transaction reflects anything but
credit on the officer at the time in
charge of the Marine Dept.

Dated 10 November 1896.
Received 11. 11. 96
Enclosures
Spare copies

18/11/86

SUBJECT.

stating further information
in connection with expenses
incurred in conveying
a 5 ton crane from Gopalpur
to Madras.

The P.P.O. 17/11/86

17/11/86

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	5436	mar	5-11-96
94	mis	mar	15-2-96
14174	mis	mar	3-6-96
133	mis	mar	13-11-96
1087	mis	mar	8-11-96
11800		P.G.	20-3-

FURTHER PAPERS.

[illegible]

No. 2/362 G

Presidency Port Office,
Madras, 10 November, 1896.

From

Commander H. A. Street, R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer,
Madras

To

The Secretary to Government,
Marine Department,
Chepak.

Sir,

In reply to Marine Department Memorandum, No. 543,E,dated 5th November 1896, I have the honor to state that as the transaction took place while Commander Powell was in charge of the Port Department, I have no personal knowledge of what occurred; but from what I am able to ascertain, it appears that the Crane was despatched from Berhampore to Bezwada by the East Coast Railway and from thence to Madras by Canal. The Railway charges up to date of delivery at Bezwada amounted to Rupees 542-8-0, which sum was paid by the Port Officer, Masulipatam, under Commander Powell's order, as the Railway Authorities refused to deliver the Crane without payment. The Traffic Superintendent, East Coast Railway, was then addressed by this office respecting the charge, and from his reply it appears that the amount was made up as follows:-

	Rs.	A.	P.
East Coast Railway charges from			
Berhampore to Bezwada	267	4	0
Transshipment charges	65	0	0
East Coast Railway Crane charge..	20	0	0
Demurrage for 127 hours	95	4	0
Boat Dock charges	5	0	0
	452	8	0
Demurrage charged by Southern			
Mahratta Railway for 4 days	78	0	0
Southern Mahratta Railway			
Crane charge	5	0	0
Haulage from Jadapalli & back ..	2	0	0
Haulage for empty timber trucks			
from Nandial	5	0	0
	542	8	0

Eventually

Eventually the Traffic Superintendent agreed to forego the demurrage charge of Rupees 95-4-0 made by him, and as Rupees 20-6-0 out of this claim had not been paid, he refunded Rupees 74-14-0.

2. With respect to the demurrage charge of Rs90, made by the Southern Mahratta Railway, the Traffic Superintendent, East Coast Railway, stated that he had been informed that the Traffic Manager, Southern Mahratta Railway, had agreed to forego the same, but as stated in this office letter No. 2/335, M, dated 19th October, '96, the latter official now objects to forego this sum, and, as explained to Government in that letter, it seems to me, for the reason quoted therein, he has made out a good case for his Company.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Obedient Servant,

A. Theet

Commdr., R.I.M.,

Presidency Port Officer.

J.M.

Marine (1896) Department.

CURRENT No. 1128

For Orders.

The Railway Company From,
is clearly entitled to be paid;
The Port Officer Masulipatam
should have made better
arrangements, and thus have
presented a claim of this
kind.

The Presidency Port Officer,
Madras

No. 2/335 G

Dated 19 October 1896.

Received 20.10.96

Enclosures "

In Spare copies

SUBJECT.

C.S. This is a most confused business -
Happens that the crane was sent from
Berwada by canal. If so, what was
the rail freight of Rs 303-10-0 paid for?
Presumably for freight from Berwada (?)
to Hoowadu - If so, it appears an ex-
orbitant charge & I don't quite see
in any case why it was paid to the
M.R. which can have had nothing to do
with it between those places -
Then in his letter quoted, the Traffic
Manager M.R. writes in one place
of a refund being claimed by the P.P.O.
but another that the money had not
been paid - I don't understand
Requesting sanction for
the payment of 70/- to the
Southern Mahratta Railway
being demurrage charges
in connection with the
conveyance of a 5 Ton
crane from Masulipatam
to Madras.

RD
22/10/96

BACK PAPERS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No. 2/335 *h*

Presidency Port Office,
Madras, 19th October, 1896.

From

Commander H. A. Street, R.I.M.,
Presidency Port Officer,

To

The Secretary to Government,
Marine Department,

Sir,

With reference to the sum of Rupees(393-10- 0) three hundred and ninety three and annas ten sanctioned by G.O.No.94 Marine, dated 15th February 1896, in connection with expenses incurred in conveying a 5 ton crane from Gopalpore to Madras, I have the honor to acquaint you, for the information of Government, that the Traffic Manager of the Southern Mahratta Railway has now put forward a claim for Rupees(78) seventy eight, being demurrage charges on account of the above due to him.

2. In regard to this claim, it appears that the booking of the crane by the Southern Mahratta Railway was carried out under the orders of the Port Officer at Nasulipatam acting under instructions from this office, and the reason why the crane was not forwarded on by that Railway was because it was afterwards decided by *the* Port Officer to have it sent by canal as being the most economical course.

3. The Traffic Manager it seems agreed to forgo² the claim for demurrage which he put forward before the Government was asked to sanction the sum of Rupees (393-10-0) three hundred and ninety three and annas ten, but he now states that he did so under a misapprehension as to the facts of the case.

4. It is clear that the crane was placed on the

truck of the Southern Mahratta Railway, and this was done through a mistake of the Boat Superintendent at Bezwada whom the Port Officer Masulipatam had instructed to see to its conveyance.

5. The Traffic Manager in his last letter to me on the subject writes as follows:-

"The Waggons were under load for some time to the prejudice of other traffic, and in these circumstances do you not think the Railway is entitled to the amount collected from you, the refund of which you now claim.

The case was not fully represented to me at first and I was under the impression that the amount had been collected from you in excess and that you were therefore entitled to a refund."

6. I think that he has made out a fair case for his claim and therefore beg that sanction may be accorded to the payment of the sum claimed.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Obedient Servant

H. Atteet

Commander, R.I.M.,

Presidency Port Officer.

M.