

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 21527	1376	Press Mis.
Dated	3-6-	1872

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department
3rd June 1872.

Read the following papers:—

- | | |
|---------|--|
| No. 21. | |
| No. 22. | From the Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division.
(Here enter No. 2,324, dated 8th March 1872.) |
| No. 23. | From do. do. do. do.
(Here enter No. 2,360, dated 11th March 1872.) |
| No. 24. | G. O., Nos. 163-162, 18th March 1872. |
| No. 25. | From the Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division.
(Here enter No. 357, dated 10th May 1872.) |
| No. 26. | From do. do. do. do.
(Here enter No. 437, dated 19th May 1872.) |

No. 27. ORDER THEREON, 3rd June 1872, No. 1,376.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 2.

THE above correspondence relates to an estimate of Rupees 5,882, for repairs to the Tungatoor Gungareddy channel,

sent in by Supervisor Cowley, Pullampett Range Officer in Cuddapah District, on the 10th June 1871, and sanctioned and provided with funds by the Superintending Engineer of the 3rd Division, on the 6th September 1871. The assessment of the channel was entered at Rupees 6,258, Government, from 1,276 acres of land, and Rupees 4,039, inam, from 335 acres, and the average and highest revenue of the last five years at Rupees 3,772 and Rupees 3,836, respectively. In column 12 the estimate is stated to provide for clearing *both* channels, and that *both* channels have the same ayacut (only one being named), and that the work estimated for was required because they had silted up during last monsoon, and that berms had to be cut and a sluice repaired. The items of the estimate were—

Rupees	337	Excavating in earth, at 2 Annas per cubic yard.
"	1,440	Sandy soil, at Annas 1-4.
"	3,664½	Rocky, at 12 Annas.
"	66	Rough stone work, at 1 Rūpee.
"	90	Stone-in-chunam, at 3 Annas per cubic foot.
"	4	Plastering, at Rupees 2-8-0 per square.
"	280½	Superintendence and sundries.
	5,882	

2. The first letter above quoted charges the Range Officer and Overseer Wade (of whom the former was suspended and the latter dismissed on 14th October 1871) with attempt at fraud, on a communication from the then Taluq Overseer Serjeant Ward to the effect that, on proceeding with a contractor to carry out the work, he found the estimate to be fictitious, no rocky cutting being necessary and not more clearing than the ryots ought to do themselves. He further states, on the information of a villager and the reddy, that Singaravaloo Mōdelliar and Rungasawiny Naidoo, the Imperial and Local Fund Maistries then in the taluq, had made the estimate, neither Mr. Cowley nor Mr. Wade having visited the place.

3. The second letter submits a communication from Madar Saib, a Cuddapah Taluq Contractor, imported by Assistant Engineer Hunter, now in charge of the

range, in which are reported in detail the discrepancies between the estimated work and that measured by him when he accompanied Serjeant Ward on the 24th February to commence working operations. According to Madar Saib the reddy stated the estimate to have been framed by Messrs. Cowley and Wade, and proposed to him to pretend to carry it out that they might share its amount after doing two or three hundred rupees worth of clearing; stating that he had been a partner in similar frauds with other contractors on the—

1. Siddapuram Channel.
2. Nullapoorreddy Pentacalva.
3. Obili Channel.
4. Narrain Nellore Channel.
5. Pundaloor Channel.

4. Contractor Madar Saib also claimed re-payment of advances, amounting to Rupees 500, which he said he had made to about 800 coolies and wudders whom he engaged for the work, but could not employ as there was nothing for them to do.

5. The first of the orders above quoted (which is wrongly numbered second) is based upon the misapprehension that there was a clerical error in the estimate sanctioned by the Superintending Engineer, whereas it was in the Taluq Overseer's copy that such error existed. In the second order it is unaccountably assumed that the subject matter of both letters is not the same, and that the amount of estimate was not given, which was not the case really. But the complaint of want of further explanation why Messrs. Cowley and Wade should be accused of attempt at fraud on the Overseer's report which established nothing more than culpable negligence against them, and the call for explanation from the Taluq writer of the discrepancy in his copy of the estimate, were quite in order; and the Superintending Engineer's reply, No. 357 of 10th May, is neither as speedy nor satisfactory as it should have been.

6. The explanations promised from Messrs. Cowley and Wade two months ago have not been supplied, and can no longer be waited for. There is enough evidence before Government to show Mr. Cowley to have been guilty of such neglect as would have led to nearly Rupees 6,000 being spent on one fictitious work; the presumption being that similar large sums have been thrown away on other works of the same nature, such as those named in the contractor's petition. Nos. 2, 4, and 6 of those works are identical with those for which cheques No. 172 for Rupees 1,871-13-6, No. 171 for Rupees 1,476-13-6, and No. 170 for Rupees 3,890 were paid away under most suspicious circumstances to contractors V. Muthookrishna Moodelliar, Shashia Reddy, and P. Paupia Naidoo (see G. O., No. 2,770 of 2nd November 1871,) with whom the Government accordingly prohibit any of their officers entering into contracts in future. Without prejudice to their right of prosecuting him criminally hereafter when full inquiry shall have been made, and to make room at once for promotion of deserving men, the Government decree Mr. Cowley's dismissal from the date of his suspension, with forfeiture of all back pay beyond the usual subsistence allowance. The contractor Madar Saib deserves all consideration for his honesty, and the Collector of Cuddapah will be requested to have his claims considered by a Punchayet, and reported on at an early date.

7. The Government are not at all inclined to concur with the Superintending Engineer's view of his responsibility as to estimates. In their remarks, printed with Order No. 1,599 of 18th June 1863, sanctioning the present organization of the department, it is distinctly laid down as one duty of a Superintending Engineer, that he shall "scrutinize all estimates," and that he shall be "responsible for correctness of estimates," and Government are not of opinion that proper care was taken when out of Rupees 6,000 sanctioned for clearing a channel stated only to have been silted up by a preceding monsoon, an item of Rupees 3,664 for excavation in rocky soil was passed without remark. Had the clerical error supposed to have existed in the estimate really escaped notice in the Superintending Engineer's Office, Government would most assuredly have called upon him to refund Madar Saib's advances. As it is they must mark their opinion of Lieutenant-Colonel A. Moberly's mismanagement of the 3rd Division and shortcomings as a Superintending Engineer, by declining to accede to his request in letter No. 261 of 1st May, for re-employment in the Bellary District on his return from furlough.

8. In the opinion of Government, with reference to this and all former charges connected with Pullampett Range, Lieutenant-Colonel Moberly should have kept the investigation more in his own hands, instead of delegating it to a young Assistant Engineer in charge of another range. He should have made arrangements to spend much of his time in the range himself till he had got to the bottom of affairs and been able to report definitely to Government, embodying his conclusions in formal "charges" against the Range Officer and his Overseer, if he considered them guilty of actual fraud. The Superintending Engineer will now be good enough to state the conclusions he has arrived at with reference to the Taluq Overseer's Writer and the two Maistries mentioned in Serjeant Ward's report, and will forward for inspection the original estimate passed in his office, that held by Serjeant Ward, that in possession of the Overseer's Writer, and the original in the Range Office, reporting by whom each copy is written.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) G. W. WALKER, Colonel, R.E.,

Officiating Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, 3rd Division.
" Controller of Public Works Accounts.
" Revenue Department.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.

Expenditure
List of Estimate for Repair of Irrigation Works recommended for the sanction of the Chief Engineer 2022.

No.	Taluq.	Description of work.	Amount of Estimate.	Total.	Ayacut under Tank or Channel.		Average Revenue of last 5 years.	Highest Revenue during the above period.	Date and cost of last Repairs.		Explanation of necessity &c.	REMARKS.
					Acres.	Assessment.			Year.	Amount.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
49	Pillmupett	Repair of Irrigation Channel										
		2096 Cms. Earthwork " 2" 337										
		17280 of Sandy soil " 1.6 440										
		4886 of Peaty " 12 366										
		66 High Stone 1-0-0 66										
		1536 of Stone masonry " 3-0-0 90										
		1600 of Stone masonry " 4-0-0 64										
		Supervisors & Peasants										
		Total Estimated Rs		5882								

Pillmupett Range Office
 Dated 10th June 1871
 In charge of Pillmupett Range
 Col: 13 Should contain information as to the amount which could be spent during the Official year.
 Vide Cir No. 214 dated 22nd May 1865.
 Superintending Engineer 3rd Division.
 Ap. Collector
 1871

Copy of Docket No. 208 Dated 26th February 1872 from the
Overseer in charge Pullumpett Talook, to the Officer in
charge Pullumpett Range.

Your Docket No. 612 of 16th Instant.

States that, having, in accordance with the above, visited
Tungatoo in order to point out to Contractor Madar Shie,
the work given to him to do the undersigned finds that
there is little or no work to be done; certainly none beyond
what the ryots might do themselves, with the exceptions
noted below. The whole Estimate is fictitious. The Overseer's
suspicions were first aroused on observing that the last item
in the sanctioned Estimate and the most heavy one was
wrong, either in the measurements or contents being $781 \times$
 $2 \times 1 = 1562$ Cubic yards of rock, instead of 4,686 as entered.
These suspicions were further confirmed on comparison of
the Estimate sent, with a copy found in the Talook writer's
possession, in which the last three items are totally differ-
ent from the entries in the sanctioned Estimate, and the
item above referred to, is entered as $260 \times 1 \times 1\frac{1}{2} = 390$ Cubic Yds.
A very suspicious circumstance also, is that while this
copy, kept for records, differs so widely from the sanctioned
Estimate in the detail, the abstract is a copy of that sent
for sanction as is not in accordance with the detail of

which

187 - 72.

Receipt Register No. 111

Contractor District

Pullumpett Range

From,

Officer in charge

Pullumpett Range

To,

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division.

Dated 10th

Received 12

June 5107

P.M. 1224/2

cc/29

List of Estimates for repair of Irrigation
Works recommended for the sanction of the

Chief Engineer 2895

which it purports to be, in abstract. On visiting the channel the Reddy was sent for, and interrogated as to the repairs required. The answers in each instance concurred with the figures in the Estimate, and, in the above notable one, he gave no measurements $781 \times 2 \times 1$ (knowing them by heart) but at the same time added, that he knew something in excess had been entered, under this head though not at his suggestion. He informed me that the Estimate was made by two Maistries, and I have ascertained from a Mahomedan of the village that these two were Linga Rao and Mondeliah & Rungia Ramy Maister, the Imperial & Local Fund Maistries then in the Taluk. The Reddy said that neither Mr Wade nor Mr Casley visited the place. It appears to the undersigned that this is a deliberate attempt to defraud Government, and affords a complete indication of the character of these two men.

The work actually required is as follows:-

Gungareddy Channel.

Cutting Banks — 280 Yards - Sandy

Deepening at head — 264 — " — "

Plastering — 40 x 4 Sft. —

Deepening of bed — $2 \frac{1}{2} \times 2 \frac{1}{3} = 133 \frac{1}{3}$ Yards

Cotta Channel

Cutting Banks — 424 6 Yards.

The

The deepening of the Cotta channel is quite unnecessary.

This work cannot now be executed owing to the ryots needing the water for irrigation, and the undersigned has thought it inadvisable to execute anything in so unsatisfactory and untrue an Estimate.

The ryots too, should themselves execute this work.

The Contractor has declined having anything whatever to do with the work and deserves credit for his unwillingness to lend himself to this fraud.

Forwards herewith the corrected Estimate, & request instructions regarding it.

Bellary
8th March
1872

W. H. B. G. Lieut. Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer 3rd Div.

No. 2324

Superintending Engineer's Office,
3rd Division.

Bellary 8th March 1872

From,

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division,

To,

The Secretary to Government

Public Works Department
Fort Saint George

Enclosures. 2

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for the information of Government the enclosed copy of a despatch from Serjt. R. M. Ward, Talook Officer at present in charge of Pollampett Taluk, dated 24th J. March, to the address of the Officer in charge Pollampett Range, in which he brings to notice a very gross instance of attempt at fraud on the part of both Mr. Cowley, as Range Officer and Mr. Wade as Surveyor responsible equally with Mr. Cowley for the correctness of all details connected with Estimates for the repair of Irrigation Works.

2. Serjeant Ward refers so fully to the facts of the case, that it needs no comments by me. A copy of the Estimate submitted for sanction is also enclosed

+ No 208 of 26th
February 1872

Enclosure. As letter No 2324
of 8th March 1872 from the
Engineer 3rd Div. to the Secy
to Government. W. M. Ward.

5107
P. M. 122472.

for reference:

2. I have furnished both Messrs. Knolly & Mait
with a copy of Defiant Mails dated for my explana-
tion they may have to offer.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Yours most Obedient Servant

A. M. C.

Lieut. Col. R. E.

Superintending Engineer, S. C. Canal

Copy of Letter No dated Pondicherry 27th February 1872, from
Muzirisampett Madar Sub to the Officer in charge Pullumputt Range.

P. W. 18th Sept
From, *Pro for Major*
No 1221.
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Division.

To,
The Secretary to Government.
Public Works Department.
Fort Saint George.

No. 2324

Dated 8
Received 18 *March* 1872.

Ex. 2.

Towards for information
Copy of a District from Supt.
Hard Engineer of Pullumputt
District, to the address of the
Pullumputt Range Office
bringing to notice a very
gross instance of attempt at
fraud on the part of
Mefro. *Copy of Mefro*
No 1376. 3 June 1872

With reference to your District No 61 dated 16th Instant,
stating that I collected about 80 - 100 lbs of mud, with
the tools, advancing them to the for their journey from
Pondicherry to Bangalore, and then to the Pullumputt, and
not the same for the 15th Instant, and obtained more
tools, and, according to the 15th Instant, and the 15th Instant, and
announcing the change, I have also & learned on the
20th Instant, they did not the company. I found as it
was.

Description of work	Estimated			Actual	H. S. & Co.			Remarks
	£	s	d		£	s	d	
Remuneration from house proceeding cost.								
Expenses for 1st lot in the head of road	40	2	6	40	20	11	1	200 What to be ex- cluded. 164
Remuneration from the Land nothing to be paid	150	0	0	150	0	0	0	280 " " " " 280 " " " " 280
Building from the " " " " " "	10	0	0	10	0	0	0	Not required
" " " " " "	80	2	0	80	0	0	0	do
" " " " " "	150	0	0	150	0	0	0	do
" " " " " "	100	0	0	100	0	0	0	do
" " " " " "	200	0	0	200	0	0	0	do
Expenses for 2nd lot not including 1st lot	200	2	1	200	0	0	0	Not required
Planting with chur near front of house	40	0	0	40	0	0	0	Not required particulars

must be, but I found the summing I reported in the year
before.

For copy

Received of the
1st of 1872
The Superintendent Engineer
Bellary

Received of the
1st of 1872
The Superintendent Engineer
Bellary

5107
P. M. 12/4/72.

Received of the
1st of 1872
The Superintendent Engineer
Bellary

Received of the
1st of 1872
The Superintendent Engineer
Bellary

Received of the
1st of 1872
The Superintendent Engineer
Bellary

Received of the
1st of 1872
The Superintendent Engineer
Bellary

Received of the
1st of 1872
The Superintendent Engineer
Bellary

Received of the
1st of 1872
The Superintendent Engineer
Bellary

No. 2360

Superintending Engineer's Office.

3rd Division.

Bellary 11th March 1872

From,

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division.

To,

The Secretary to Government

Public Works Department

Fort Saint George

Enclosures. /

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 2324 dated 8th Instant, I have the honor to forward for information true copy of letter dated 29th February 1872 from Mr. Madar Sub-Contractor.

2. In this letter the Contractor while bringing to notice the conspiracy of the Meddy and others to defraud Government, represents the loss he sustained in having to advance to coolies & Mudders a sum of about Rs 500/- and that in consequence of the Estimate being false, he was unable to proceed with the work and thereby reimbursed himself.

3. The irregularities connected with the Contractor in the Pullumpet Range, led Mr. Assistant Engineer Hunter with the approval of the Officer

to

to send Madan Sub, a Buddapah Bullock Con-
tractor to do the work & as to complete the same
by the end of the Official year, and that he had -
not the opportunity of going on with the work was
no fault of his.

4 I am certain Government would not wish
to see the man a loser for having acted so honestly
in refusing to have anything to do with the Con-
tract, and I therefore trust his case may meet
with special and favorable consideration to such
extent as the Government considered sufficient to com-
pensate him for the loss of his money, as the Coolies
& others being men of other places, he can scarcely
hope to recover the sums paid them and more so
as it is most probable they dispersed so soon as
the Contractor returned to Buddapah.

5. I have written to the Collector regarding
the Reddy of Tingat or 16 hope to report further
should I hear there will be sufficient proof
forthcoming to prosecute all parties concerned
in the case for conspiring to defraud Government.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Yours most Obedt. Servant

Wm. H. R. E.
Superintending Engineer B. & O.

No. 357

Superintending Engineer's Office.

3rd Division.

Bellary 10th May 1872.

From,

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division.

To,

The Secretary to Government

Enclosures.

Public Works Department

Fort Saint George

Sir,

Tungabhadra Gunjagaddi Channel.
Pullampett Talook.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the order of Government notified in the margin and to report as under:-

1. In making my first report on the 10th March 1872, I would observe that for the first time, I was made aware of the state of affairs on account of Sergeant Ward's report the day previous. Prima facie the representation of Sergeant Ward will be admitted to be a clear one as it seemed to me to be a mere statement of fact as they occurred to him and being such, I considered it was my duty to report the matter to Government without delay.

10th 162/163 dated
18th March 1872.

To,
The Secretary to Government,
Public Works Department,
Fort Saint George.

3rd Division.

To,

No. 2365

Dated 11th March 1872.
Received 14th March 1872.

Chief Engineer's Office of Bellary
10th 2364 dated 10th March 1872.

Chief Engineer's Office of Bellary
10th 2364 dated 10th March 1872.

Chief Engineer's Office of Bellary
10th 2364 dated 10th March 1872.

Chief Engineer's Office of Bellary
10th 2364 dated 10th March 1872.

Chief Engineer's Office of Bellary
10th 2364 dated 10th March 1872.

Chief Engineer's Office of Bellary
10th 2364 dated 10th March 1872.

10th 2364 dated 10th March 1872.

Chief Engineer's Office of Bellary
10th 2364 dated 10th March 1872.

adding such information as I could obtain at the time from the record of my own Office.

3. That I had intended to base the whole of this case upon the first Report I made would be an erroneous impression, as I clearly stated in para 3 of my letter N^o 2324 dated 8th March 1872, that I had called upon both Messrs Cowley and Wade for their explanations. The matter having been referred to Government, it must be clear that no independent have been to forward these various claims and all such further information I could collect to go with them.

4. On the 11th March 1872, I received a second letter from Contractor Messrs. Cuddihill & Pullen of Saltash to carry out the work. On the same day I forwarded a copy of this letter as an enclosure to my letter N^o 2360. I do not therefore see how Government could consider I had imperfectly laid the case before them as I had dealt with it in the only available records at hand. The incompleteness of my reports may have been in not noting the amount of the Estimate but if you will refer to para 2 of my letter N^o 2324 dated 8th March 1872, you will observe that I sent a copy of the Estimate itself and which I may here mention, was for N^o 5582.

5. The nature of the information brought to notice by Contractor Messrs. Cuddihill & Pullen is such as to make it incumbent on me to refer (see para 5 of my letter

N^o 2360.

N^o 2360 dated 11th March 1872) the matter to the Collector for investigation and I believe the inquiry is being made by the Head Assistant Collector on the spot as to the truth of the Messrs' assertion which so intimately connects Messrs. Cowley and Wade with the case.

6. The Contractor, as far as I can learn, received no advance from the Pillumpett Range Officer to carry out the work. He is a fairly well to do man and would require none; certainly, I would not and don't allow cash advances to be made unless adequate security is lodged and if there are reasonable grounds to suppose that such advances are likely to be worked up during the month in which granted.

7. As regards checking of Estimates with details for the repair or durability of Irrigation works, I maintain that this Office since the reorganization in 1863 never considered this to be a part of its duty. The Estimates are prepared as the case may require, in the Abstract form of Estimates given at pages 465 and 466 of the Circular Order Book and as the position of the present "Superintending Engineer" is relative with that of the then "Chief Engineer" it will at once be apparent that as Superintending Engineer, it is not an established practice for details of repair Estimates to be sent up. The check would simply be in reference to Arithmetical calculations and would answer no useful purpose.

8. Range Officers who are placed in position of responsibility are bound to satisfy themselves of

the correctness of detail measurements sent in
by their subordinates before submitting the
estimated Estimates for approval and sanction,
and I therefore submit that if a Range Officer
lends himself to a conspiracy to defraud Govern-
ment, it would be impossible to separate the
honest from the dishonest. It is of course quite
within the province of the Superintending Engi-
neer during his tours of inspection to measure
up work and otherwise satisfy himself and this
I have frequently done but it is intended that I
am not to accept and pass any Estimates unless
I have personally satisfied myself of the correct-
ness of measurements when a responsible Range
Officer signs it as correct. I would then submit
that the present organization will not permit of
this being done.

The whole of the papers were sent up to
Mr Assistant Engineer Hunter who is personally
obtaining all information in communication
with the Head Assistant Collector on the various
points the records show as being required and on
receipt back the matter will be laid before Govern-
ment in a complete form.

I have &c

W. H. S. S. S. S.
Superintending Engineer
S. S. S.

No 18 March 1/2 No 162-163

P. W. 1872-73
From, No 2388
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Division.

To,
The Secretary to Government.
Public Works Department.
Fort Saint George.

No. 357
Dated 11 May 1872
Received

The Government will receive the complete report forwarded in Para 9.

No 25

2220 May 17 2025

Offers & explanation
in reference to G.O.S
No 162-163 of 13 March 1872
about Tungabhadra
Gangavathi Channel
Pulimuttu Taluk
No 1346 of 13 March 1872

From Supervisor O. H. Cowley D. P. W.
To the Superintending Engineer 3rd Division

Sir,

In reply to your No 2326 of the
8th Instant enclosing copy of a letter from
the Overseer in charge of Pulimuttu Taluk,
I have the honor to state that I did in
company with the then Taluk Overseer
inspect the channels in question which
my Diggs will prove and if I recollect
right the depths entered in Mr Wade's
original Estimate were considerably re-
duced by me.

* The necessity
for the work
will be found
in the Report
forwarded by
the Rev Author.

It is a sheer impossibility for the Range
Officers to check all Estimates, and I presume
the responsibility of framing them devolves
on the Overseer to whom works of this
kind are entrusted. Mr Overseer Wade's
expression. "It appears to the undersigned
that this is a deliberate attempt to de-
ceive the Government and affords a com-
plete indication of the character of these
two men" will, (as far as I am concerned),
be laid before a member of the Bar for
his opinion

I have the honor to be
Sir

Madras
13th March 1872
Your Obedient Servant
Signed/ O. H. Cowley Supr. P. W.
Like No 357 of 10 May 1872. & your
address, I find that bottle of

Enclosure

Enclosed Captain R.

Offg. Supy. Engineer 3rd Div.

19/5/72

Thru

Mr. O. A. Condy

Super 2nd

5107

1/2

Rebels with reference to

Book 1st 2326 of 8th Div.

Regarding the petition

to the court for the removal

of the court of the court

No. 437.

Superintending Engineer's Office.

3rd Division.

Bellary 19th May/72.

From,

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division.

To,

The Secretary to Government

Public Works Department

Fort Saint George

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt this morning of your telegram of yesterday's date, and as you seem to require an immediate disposal, I have no time in meeting your wishes.

2. From a list of the papers referred to the Officer in charge of Pullumpet Range. I finally completed the case in communication with the Revenue authorities (vide para 5 of Colonel Moberg's letter no 357 of 10th May 1872, by your address), I find that both of

From
Mr O. H. Conley
Super. D.P.W.

Enclosures. 2.

5107
P.W. 5550/72

Explanation in continuation
of his letter of 13 March pp.
regarding the fictitious esti-
mate for Tomyatrol
Gingareddy Channel

Mr. Comley's letters were sent
in original to the Assistant
Inspector Hunter in case the same
were required for reference. However,
as I find copies of these letters
were taken, as a precaution in
case the originals are lost, for
record in this office, I herewith
forward them to same time.

I have written for the originals
and shall send them as soon as
received.

3. I may add that I have seen
only some of the documents on the
subject of this section's estimate
for the repair of the Amgala or
Gungaredy Channel, and un-
til I obtain the report of the result
of inquiries by the Revenue autho-
rities, I shall not be able to send in
my report, nor do I see that Govern-
ment can pass final orders until
they are in possession of the result
of the investigation referred to.

4. I have called upon the Collector
and Mr. Hunter to expedite the
transmission of all the papers

sent

No. 2/22

Sent to them.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Yours most obediently

James D. Hill Captain R.
City Inspector

The Comtee's letters were recd

No. 2122

Superintending Engineer's Office.

3rd Division.

Bellary 11th February 1872.

From,

The Superintending Engineer

3rd Division.

To,

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort St. George.

Enclosures.

Sir,

With reference to G. O. No. 375 dated 4th Instant, I have the honor to observe that the statements referred to in paragraph 10 of my letter No. 1814 dated 19th December 1870, were sent with my letter No. 1913 dated 18th January 1872. I regret not having quoted the reference to the above paragraph when sending the statements in question. It was said the necessity for the present reference.

I have &c

P. H. S. S. S.
Super. Engineer 3rd Div.

To,

The Secretary to Government.
Public Works Department.
Fort Saint George.

No. 1437

Dated

Received

1872.

Encl. 12

Public Works 1872: 22. *As per last*
From *for duty* 2570

The Superintending Engineer
3rd Division.

10/13/76 - 8-8-1872

Abstract Notes.

Sergeant R. W. Ward,
 Overseer in charge of Pail-
 lumpett Talook, vice
 Mr. Overseer Wade, repre-
 sents on 26th February that
 an Estimate of Rs. 5-882 for
 clearing the Gungareddy
 and Cotten Channels, is
 fictitious. Nothing being
 required but ordinary
 clearing by the Villagers.
 That the estimate was made
 by Singaravalas Madelias.

To
 The Commissioner
of the Madras District
Madras

From,

(20/2-88-829

The Superintending Engineer
 3rd Division.

No. 2722

Date d. 11/2/1872.
 Received by 11/2/1872.
 ENCLOSURES.

Myself accompanied
 by Mr. H. B. S. S. S. S.
 and Mr. S. S. S. S. S.
 have been to the
 Talook of Pail-
 lumpett Talook.

and Pungasammy Aidas,
the Imperial and Local
Fund Maistries; and that
neither the Overseer Mr.
Wade, nor the Range Offi-
cer Mr. Cowley ever saw
the work - (so at least the
Reddy stated). That in the
estimate was one glaring
arithmetical error, $781 \times 2 \times 1$,
being made = 4686, or 3
times the correct amount,
1562 cubic yards, of Rock
to be removed at 12 annas
per cubic yard which
made an excess of Rs. 2343.
That in the Taluk minters
copy of the detailed estimate
the last 3 items differ to-
tally from the entries in
the sanctioned estimate,

the item above referred to
being $260 \times 1 \times 1\frac{1}{2} = 390$ cubic
yards, but the copy of the
abstract estimate coinci-
ded with the sanctions.
That the Reddy stated the
measurements shown in
the sanctioned estimate to
be quite correct.

The estimate is dated 10 June 1871.

Sanctioned 1st September

Assessment - Circular Rs. 6258 Annas. 4039

5 years average Revenue 3772

No. Highest ——— 3836

Both channels are
mentioned in Column of
necessity of work, but the
Tingaboor fungaredy
channel alone is mentioned
in the heading. and the
Cotten channel which is
shown in the detailed estimate

is said by the Contractor
to have no connection
with the Gungareddy
Channel. In explanation
of the necessity for the
work it is stated that
both channels silted
up during last monsoon.

In the Supr. Engineer's
letter forwarding the
Overseer's Report No. 2324
of 8th March he charges
Mr. Cowley with attempt
at fraud and Mr. Wade,
as responsible for cor-
rectness of all details con-
nected with repair esti-
mates. only adds that
he has given them copies
of Sergeant Ward's docket
for any explanation they
may offer.

His letter No. 2360 of
11th March forwards the
Contractor Madar Sahib's
Report of 29th February -
in which he names Ganga
Raghava Reddy as the
Village Munsiff Reddy
and Mr. Cowley and
Wade as the framers of
the estimate on receiving
Rs. 40 bribe, and specifies

Siddaparram Channel.	as other works on which the same Reddy had been partner with Contractors.
Mullapoorreddi Penta Calwa.	
Abili Channel.	
Narain Nellore Channel.	
Pundaloor Channel.	

Madar Sahib petitions
for return of Rs. 500. which
he advanced to about 800

1. Cookies and Widders whom
2. he could not employ as
3. there really was nothing
4. to do.

5. G.O. No 163 of 18 March,
6. calls for report why the
7. estimate was not scruti-
8. nized by the Supy Engineer,
9. and for submission of the
10. Talook Writers explanation
11. of the discrepancy between
12. the copies of the estimate.
13. and to explain how Messrs
14. Cowley and Wade could
15. be charged with "attempt
16. at fraud", if they did
17. not visit the work.

18. G.O. No 162 of same
19. date is written
20. under the misappre-
21. hension that
22. another ground
23. had been reported
24. on by the Supy Engr - G.M.W.

45
Memorandum.

34
The Officiating Secretary
to Government in the Public Works
Department has the honor to Circu-
late the accompanying Draft Order
of Government for approval, after
having obtained Copies of Mr
Supervisor Cowley's defence, which
shew the utter inutility of wait-
ing for more evidence before
dispensing with his services and
filling up his place, leaving
the question of prosecuting him
criminally for consideration after
receipt

receipt of the further information
so long promised, but which
may not come to hand for
an indefinite time, during which
the Department ^{will} suffer for want
of a Range Officer.

Wm. A. C. Colwell P.E.

Officiating Secretary to Govt
S. H. Dept

Fort St. George
May 18/2

Letters from ^{No 1376} Supers: 3rd Div.
No 2324 of 8th March 1872

2360 - 11th Nov

Govt. Orders No 163, 162 of 18th March

Supers: letter No 357 of 10th Decy

do do (434 of 19th May 1872)

This should be
circulated.

H.

A. V.

J. O. S.

The above Corres.

pondence relates to an
Estimate of Rupees 5882
for Repairs to the Tur-
gator Tungareddy
Channel, sent in by
Supervisor Cowley, Pil-
lappett Range Officer
in Cuddalore District,
on the 10th June 1871, and
sanctioned and provided
with funds by the
Sup Engineer 3rd Division
and

on the 6th September 1871.
The assement of the
Channel was entered at
Rupees 6258 Government
from 1276 acres of land
and Rupees 4039 from
from 335 acres, and the
average and highest Re-
venue of last 5 years at
Rupees 3772 and Rs 3836
respectively. In Column
12 the Estimate is stated
to provide for clearing
both Channels, and that
both Channels have the
(only one being named)
same Ayacut, and that
the work estimated for
was required because
they had silted up during
last Monsoon, and
that

47
that beins had to be cut
and a sluice repaired.
The Items of the Esti-
mate were
Rupees 337- Excavating in earth at 20th ft
— 1440 — Sandy Soil at 1-4 —
— 366 1/2 — Rocky at 120th —
— 65 Rough Stone Work - at 10th —
— 90 Stone in Churnam at 30th ft
— 4 Plastering at — Rs 2 1/2 per
— 280 1/2 Superintendence and sundries
Rupees 5882-

The first letter above
quoted charges the Range
Officer, and Overseer Wade
of whom the former was
suspended and the latter
dismissed on 14th October
1871 with a charge of
fraud, on a communication
from

from the then Taluk Over-
-seer, Sergeant Ward to
the effect that on proceeding
with a Contractor to carry
out the work he found
the Estimate to be fictitious,
no rocky cutting being ne-
-cessary and not more
clearing than the Ryots
ought to do themselves. He
further states on the informa-
-tion of a Villager and
the Reddy that Singa-
-rao Moodeler, and
Mungasawmy Naidoo, the
Imperial and Local Land
Maistries then in the
Taluk, had made the
Estimate, neither Mr
Cowley nor Mr Wade
having

Rest

15
having visited the place.
The second letter
submits a communica-
-tion from Madar Saib,
a Buddapah Taluk
Contractor imported by
Assistant Engineer Hunter
now in charge of the
Range in which are
reported in detail the
discrepancies between the
estimated work and that
measured by him when
he accompanied Sergeant
Ward on the 24th February
to commence working
operations. According to
Madar Saib the Reddy
stated the Estimate to
have been framed by
MPS

Messrs Cowley & Wade, and
proposed to him to pro-
ceed to carry it out that
they might share its
amount after doing two
or three hundred Rupees
worth of clearing; stating
that he had been a partner
in similar frauds with
other Contractors on the

1. Adilapooram Channel

2. Nullapooradly Puttalawa

3. Obili Channel

4. Narraiv Nellore Channel

5. Rudaloor Channel

Contractor Mudar

Saib also claimed repay-

ment of advances amount-

ing to Rupees 500 which

he said he had made
to

to about 800 Coolies and
Mudlars whom he en-
gaged for the work but
could not employ as
there was nothing for
them to do.

The first of the
orders above quoted (which
is wrongly numbered
Second) is based upon the
misapprehension that
there was a clerical
error in the Estimate
sanctioned by the Super-
Engineer, whereas it
was ^{in the} Talook Overseers
Copy that such error
existed. In the second
order it is unaccounta-
bly affirmed that the
Subject

Subject matters of both
letters is not the same,
and that the amount
of Estimate was not
given, which was not
the case really. But the
complaint of want of
further explanation why
Messrs Cowley & Wade
should be accused of
attempt at fraud on the
Overseers Report which
established nothing more
than culpable negligence
against them; and the
call for explanation from the
Talook Writer of the dis-
crepancy in his Copy of
the Estimate were quite
in order; and the Supg
Engineers

Recd

15
Engineers reply. 23.5/7 of
11. May is neither speedy
or satisfactory as it should
have been.

The explanations
promised from Messrs
Cowley & Wade two months
ago have not been sup-
plied, and can no
longer be waited for.
There is enough evidence
before Court to show Mr
Cowley to have been guilty
of such neglect as would
have led to nearly Rs 6000
being spent on one fictitious
work; the presumption
being that similar large
sums have been thrown
away on other works of
the same nature such
as those named in the
Contractors' petition. Nos
2, 4 & 6 of those works
are identical with those
for which cheques no 172 for
Rs 1000

Disps 1871-13. 6. No. 171
for Rs 1476. 13. 6, and
No 170 for Rs 3890 were paid
away under most suspicious
circumstances to Contractors
O. Muthoo Krishna Moodliar,
Mashia Reddy and P.
Rajia Naidu (see G.O.
No 2770 of 2. November 1871)
with whom the Government
accordingly prohibit any
of their Officers entering into
Contracts in future—
without prejudice to their
right of prosecuting him
criminally. Hereafter,
when full enquiry
shall have been made
and to make room
at once for promotion
of deserving men, the
Government do decree
Mr Cowley's dismiss-
sal from the date of
his suspension, with
forfeiture

forfeiture of all back pay
beyond the usual sub-
sistence allowance.
The Contractor Mardar
Sah deserves all con-
sideration for his ho-
nesty and the Collector
of Cuddapah will be
requested to have his
claims considered by
a Panchayet, and
reported on at an early
date.

The Govt are not at
all inclined to concur,
with the Super Engineer's
view of his responsibility
as to estimates, and in
their remarks printed
with order No. 1599 of
18 June 1863 sanctioning
the present organization

of the Department it is
distinctly laid down
as one duty of a Super Engineer
that he shall scrutinize
all estimates and that
he shall be responsible
for correctness of estimates.
And Govt are not of
opinion that proper
care was taken when
out of Rs 6,000 sanctioned
for clearing a channel
stated only to have been
silted up by a preceding
monsoon, an item of
Rs 3,664 for excavation
in rocky soil was
passed without remark.
Had the clerical error
supposed to have existed
in the estimate really
escaped notice in the

Super Engineer's office,
Govt would most assuredly
have called upon ^{him} to refund
Madar Sahib's advances.
As it is they must mark
their opinion of Lieut
Colonel Admoberly's mis-
management of the
3rd Division and short-
coming as a Super Engineer
by declining to accede
to his request in letter
No. 261 of 1st May
for reemployment in the
Bellary District on his
return from Harlaw.
In the opinion of
Govt with reference to
this and all former
charges connected with
Pullempett Range Lieut
Col Admoberly should
have kept the investigation

more) in his own hands,
instead of delegating it
to a young Assistant
Engineer in charge of
another Range. He
should have made
arrangements to spend
much of his time in the
Range himself till
he had got to the bottom
of affairs and been able
to report definitely to Govt;
embodying his conclusions
in formal charges against
the Range officer and
his Overseer, if he con-
sidered them guilty
of actual fraud. The
Lupé Engineer will
now be good enough to
state the conclusions he
has arrived at with
reference

sent

reference to the Salook
Overseer's Writer and
the 2 Ministries men-
tioned in Sergeant
Ward's report; and
will forward for in-
spection the original
estimate passed in his
office, that held by Ser-
jeant Ward, that in
possession of ^{the} Overseer's
Writer and the original
in the Range office, re-
porting by whom each
copy is written.

G.W.

20.5.72

30
The Indian Engineer
Contractors
Rev. Dept.
Principal Engineer & Collyer
W. 4/6/72.
* Dec 14/1/74

Govt. of 1872 Madras.

PUBLI WORKS.

To The Superintending Eng^r
312 Division

Dated

Recd.

Encl. 5

G. O. 3rd June 1872. No. 1896.

Nos. 21027

Meper Bowley & Wade
Passing orders on the
subject of the charges
brought against Meper
Bowley & Wade and
the working of the
Stry Colonel A. R.
Wherby 9th -

R.C. 27th Aug 1872
C. 22nd May 1872 R. 25.

Recd