

(1) Number of pages 80

(2) Date of repair 18-7-44

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

public works DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	<u>7</u>	Press Mis.
<u>12-13</u>		
Dated	<u>4-1-</u>	<u>1872</u>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
4th January 1872.*

No. 12. Read the following letter from the Superintending Engineer, 4th Division, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 24th November 1871, No. 3,475:—

ADVERTING to paragraph 1 of your memorandum, No. 92, dated 14th November 1871, requesting me to report "on the practice alleged to prevail in No. 1 Range, Chingleput District, of entering monies in the Range Accounts as *bona fide* disbursements, and of reserving portions of such monies for payments after actual execution and examination of work," I have the honour to enclose an original letter from Mr. Goodchap, the Executive Engineer in charge of the Range, in which he clearly explains the course of business generally adopted by him in making payments for works executed on contract or otherwise.

2. It will be observed that payments are invariably made in cheques, which are generally delivered at once to the parties concerned. It has, however, not been unusual to withhold, in some instances, the cheques drawn in the *last* month of the official year, until the Range Officer had time to examine the works, and this system appears to me to be a good one, as it allows of deductions being made, if necessary, on account of shortcomings on the part of contractors. It will be utterly impossible for a Range Officer to visit all the works done up to the last day of the official year, and then to draw up cheques to admit of adjustment in the accounts of the year.

3. In reference to paragraph 2 of your memorandum under reply, I beg to state that all the papers connected with the Overseer Streenevassooloo Naidoo's case were furnished, except those which would be of no use to him. The papers furnished, as well as those withheld, are herewith sent for the information of Government.

4. In my letter No. 1,943, dated 4th August last, embodied in Government Order No. 2,122, dated 18th August 1871, I clearly stated the grounds on which Streenevassooloo Naidoo merited dismissal; I would now strongly deprecate the re-entertainment of the man who has shown himself so untrustworthy, and whose conduct has so frequently been condemned by my predecessors and by the Range Officers* under whom he served.

* Mr. Leggatt.
Mr. Goodchap.

The charge of which the Overseer was found guilty was, in my opinion, a deliberate fraud. and further, in paragraph 5 of my letter to Government reporting the circumstance, it will be seen that the bill which was passed for Rupees 57 is not correct, as a foundation is included in it, whilst the sluice was built on the old foundation.

From W. A. GOODCHAP, Esq., Executive Engineer, No. 1 Range, Chingleput District, to the Superintending Engineer, 4th Division, dated Serooloor, 20th November 1871, No. 810.

With reference to a copy of a memorandum, No. 92, dated 14th November 1871, from the Secretary to Government in the Public Works Department and your Proceedings, No. 3,345, dated 15th instant attached, I have the honour

4 Contract Certificates.

1 Copy of papers given to late Talook Overseer Streenevassooloo Naidoo.

to state that it is not unusual in this range to reserve cheques drawn in favour of contractors in the last month of the official year, pending examination of works by Range Officer. These cheques are made out for sums shown to be due for work done as per contract certificates, prepared by the Overseers; and as the payments are, as a rule, final, I have always felt a hesitation in handing the cheques, prior to inspection, to the contractors. In issuing the cheques and entering their amounts as disbursements, I have always regarded the transactions as *bona fide*, supported as they were by the Overseer's contract certificates; but for the interest of Government, and in order to the exercise of that check which the Controller very properly expects Range Officers to maintain over disbursements in their ranges, and particularly over such as represent final payments, I have withheld the formal delivery of the cheques to the parties concerned till I felt satisfied that Government had received a fair amount of work for their money.

2. In all these cases the works for which the cheques are drawn are showed by the Overseers to have been executed in the year in which the transactions appear in my accounts, and the only informality in my arrangement consists in the withholding of the cheques to the parties in whose favour they are issued till I have satisfied myself of the work done.

3. The practice to which allusion is here made obtains only in the last month of the official year, and then in cases in which final payments are made; hence, if the check heretofore exercised is not to be maintained, there will be no means of obtaining refunds of money alleged to be due to contractors by the Overseers, but which on examination the Range Officer may find not to be the case.

4. The cheques drawn in March are invariably paid away, or the transactions adjusted before the end of April when the Range Officers' examinations are concluded, and any corrections that may then be necessary in the accounts are made under instructions from the Controller. In the case of works paid for in any other than the last month of the official year, portions of the claims are withheld as per contract certificates herewith sent.

Executive Engineer's letters, Nos. 312, 378, 381, 446, and 456, dated 5th, 18th, 20th of July, and 2nd and 3rd of August 1871. Superintending Engineer's memorandum, No. 1,965, dated 7th August 1871.

5. I beg to enclose a copy of papers given to Streenevassooloo Naidoo, with reference to your Proceedings, No. 1,965, dated 7th August 1871, and to report that the letters withheld from him are noted in the margin.

No. 13.

ORDER THEREON, 4th January 1872, No. 7.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 1.

FROM the above letter and its enclosure the Government observe that a practice prevails in the Clingleput Range of issuing cheques in the last month of the official year for work stated to be completed by Overseers, and that these cheques are not handed over to the Contractors but are retained till the works have been examined by the Range Officer. In order, however, that the amounts of these cheques may be debited to the expenditure of the year in which the cheques are issued, it is necessary that the contract certificates shall be signed by the contractor and be dated in March while the cheques are not handed over to him till the following year. Thus an acknowledgment of the receipt of an amount is obtained from a contractor some days or perhaps weeks before the contractor is actually paid, and in cases in which the works for which cheques have been issued are not found to have been executed in a satisfactory manner or to the extent specified in the contract certificate, it is stated

that corrections are made under instructions from the Controller. As the cheques are issued in the name of the contractor and cheques are stated to be withheld only when issued in final payment for works, it is clear that the sum to be recovered can only be obtained by calling upon the contractor to cash the cheque and to refund a portion of the amount, or by having the cheque cancelled and another cheque issued for a smaller amount; in either case the contractor might refuse to receive a smaller sum than that for which he had granted a receipt, and he might make good his claim, by an appeal to the law, on the grounds that work to the amount for which he had granted a receipt had been certified to or been passed by a competent member of the Public Works Department, leaving the claim against him to be adjusted by the Overseer who had passed a certificate in excess of work done or for inferior work which the Range Officer refused to pass. It is not right or desirable that a Range Officer should place himself in a false position and that all transactions between himself and contractors should not be of a *bona fide* character and be clearly and indubitably correct and straightforward. If an Overseer finds that the Range Officer will accept a receipt for money which is not paid, in order that funds may be got rid of at the close of an official year and not be lost to the district, he may think it not unadvisable or improper to go a step further and to certify to a work being completed when it is not so, and urge in justification that he was aware that no loss would be incurred as the work could not be actually paid for till it had been examined by a competent officer. In fact such a plea has recently been put forward by an Overseer when charged with furnishing a false completion certificate.

2. The official year terminates in the middle of the working season and a large number of works must then be in progress, and work executed up to the 31st March cannot possibly be paid for in full. It is of course desirable that completed works should be paid for and that large balances should not be due to contractors for works in progress at the close of the official year.

3. There are few ranges in which a Range Officer could not examine and pass all the work executed by the 15th March before the end of the month, and hence at the end of the year sums need not be due for any work for more than fifteen days at the most, while for the works examined later in the month hardly anything could be due. Under these circumstances, the Governor in Council directs that for completed works completion certificates shall be furnished, and that cheques shall be issued only for work which has been passed by the Range Officer, and that the cheques shall be duly delivered to contractors on the date of their issue when the completion certificates are signed by the contractors.

4. It is observed that the expenditure on Agricultural Repairs especially in the last month of the year is very large indeed, and though this may in some instances be due to the large quantity of work executed from January to March there is reason to believe that, in some districts at least, the reprehensible practice of issuing cheques for works which have not been examined or completed prevails, and that cheques thus issued are frequently retained in the cash chests for considerable periods; all Superintending Engineers are directed to put a stop to this practice where it prevails, and in order that no funds may be lost to the Presidency the Superintending Engineers in reporting what sums they would wish to surrender,

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
4th January 1872.

etc., from the allotments for Agricultural Repairs in February as directed in G. O.,
No. 2,863, dated 10th November, will bear in mind that cheques may no longer
be issued for works and be retained in the range offices.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R. E.,
Secretary to Government.

To Superintending Engineers.
.. Major R. B. Kennedy.
To the Controller of Public Works Accounts.
.. Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

Rd. E. C. Shunker.

No. 319

From

No. 1 Range Office
Secoolur 30th June 1871

W. A. Goodchap Esq^r

Executive Engineer No. 1 Range
Chingli Sub District

To

Colonel, F. T. Milleson R.E.
Superintending Engineer 4th Division

Sir

With reference to your letter of the
27th instant giving cover to two letters containing
complaints against Salig Overseer. Shrinivasappa
Naikoo and requesting me to make enquiry into
them I beg to inform you that, with reference
to the complaint made regarding the Ralla prandy
San R. since the following are the facts:-

1st That an estimate amounting to Rs. 95
for a sluice with a tunnel of 10 yard sin length
was sanctioned on the 30th May 1870 for
the Ralla prandy San R.

2nd That the work in the 1st instance was
given out on contract to one Shivan Shetty
but on the representation of the Salig
Overseer that the contractor was dilatory
in making arrangements to collect material
and

and that as the rainy season was approaching it became necessary to take the work from him and carry it out by Departmental agency. Arrangements were made accordingly and the Overseer instructed on the 26th September 1870 No. 451 to execute the work by Amari as recommended by him in his letter No. 98 dated 24th September 1870.

3rd. That the Overseer took no steps whatever for months after he was ordered to carry out the sluice work by Amari and it was ultimately given out by the Salary Overseer without reference to this Office or contract to one Ramawo of Jengaw.

4th. That the Salary Overseer forwarded to the Range Office in April 1871 a certificate in favor of the above contractor for Rs. 95 for a sluice with a tunnel 10 yds in length as per sanctioned estimate.

5th. That on my examination of the work on the 29th April 1871 I was surprised to find that only a sluice with a tunnel six yards in length had been rebuilt and it also

struck

struck me at the time that the flooding to the tunnel appeared old in comparison with other portions of the work. I immediately addressed the Mougar of the village in writing on the subject, and the answer I received from him and other villagers on the 29th April 1871 was to the effect that the old sluice had been entirely renewed and the present sluice built of new materials.

6th. That not being quite satisfied with the Mougar's explanation I addressed the Tahsildar of Trilok on the subject and after sending him two or three reminders he informed me on the 23rd May 1871 that he had no time to go to that part of the Taluk but he had arranged with the Revenue Inspector to get the necessary information which has not been received by me up to date.

7th. That the Salary Overseer's verbal explanation is that, he granted the certificate in the first instance to the

Contractor

Memorandum

The Superintending Engineer having received from Mr. Goodchap a report on two petitions against Murrivasooloetankos & Salug Overseer regarding work executed to Kallapandy sluice and a claim for work executed to Vellijoor road has carefully gone through the papers by which it appears that the Overseer sent in a contract certificate for Rs. 95 for the full amount of the first estimate which has a receipt by the Contractor also, the Certificate "Certified that the preceding claim is correct; that measurements have been made by me and that the work has been satisfactorily performed" signed by the Overseer. That after this Mr. Goodchap examined the work he found that the sluice is only six instead of 10 yds long. The above certificate showing it to be 10 yds. On this a fresh certificate was sent in for only a six yards sluice amounting to Rs. 57 this was called a revised contract certificate.

Shree

P. M. 5006/71.

contractor before he measured the work as the sluice was not completed until the end of March, and his time is occupied in closing the Salug accounts for the official year.

That the revised contract certificate granted by the Salug Overseer by my order No. 177 dated 30th May 1871 amounted to Rs. 57 which corresponds with the Range Accounts submitted to the Controller for March 1871.

I have the honor to be
Signed / M. A. Goodchap Esq. Engineer
No. 1 Range Chingliput District

(True extract)
M. A. Goodchap Esq. Engineer
No. 1 Range Chingliput District

There is evident fraud on the part of the Salug Overseer Pannu-asoolo Naidoo so that the Superintending Engineer resolves to dismiss him. The explanation given to Mr. Goodchap that he / the Maistry / gave the certificate before measuring the work is no exculpation. Before however publishing this dismissal Mr. Goodchap will obtain full particulars from the Overseer of his reason for thus signing two different certificates in order that the explanation may accompany the report to Government.

Supg. Engr's Office 4th Division
3rd July 1871 } Signed C. T. Wilkinson C.E. & Co.
Supg. Engineer 4th Division

Executive Engineer's Office of explanation
No. 1 Range Office
No. 336 Memorandum
4th July 1871

Under instructions from the Superintending Engineer No. 1432 dated 3rd July 1871 Salug Overseer Pannu-asoolo Naidoo is requested to report by return of post full particulars of his reason for signing two different certificates for the construction

of a sluice to the Pallapandy Tank. —
Signed W. A. Goodchap Esq. C.E.
No. 1 Range (Chingleput Dist.)

Idem Overseer's explanation
No. 189 15th July 1871

To
W. A. Goodchap Esq. C.E.
Executive Engineer in Charge No. 1
Range (Chingleput Dist.)

Sir
I beg respectfully to acknowledge receipt of your Memo No. 336 of the 4th instant and in reply to state that the construction of a sluice to the Pallapandy Tank therein alluded to, was first entrusted to Contractor Alwarshetty who not having attended to it until nearly the close of the official year the work was withdrawn from him and given over to one Rannu-asoolo Springan of the neighbouring Village of Panayurjerry. Having received a report from the latter individual and the Maistry employed thereon just at the close of the official year

There is evident fraud on the part of the Salug Overseer Pannu-asoolo Naidoo so that the Superintending Engineer resolves to dismiss him. The explanation given to Mr. Goodchap that he / the Maistry / gave the certificate before measuring the work is no exculpation. Before however publishing this dismissal Mr. Goodchap will obtain full particulars from the Overseer of his reason for thus signing two different certificates in order that the explanation may accompany the report to Government.

Supg. Engr's Office 4th Division
3rd July 1871 } Signed C. T. Wilkinson C.E. & Co.
Supg. Engineer 4th Division

Executive Engineer's Office of explanation
No. 1 Range Office
No. 336 Memorandum
4th July 1871

Under instructions from the Superintending Engineer No. 1432 dated 3rd July 1871 Salug Overseer Pannu-asoolo Naidoo is requested to report by return of post full particulars of his reason for signing two different certificates for the construction

of a sluice to the Pallapandy Tank. —
Signed W. A. Goodchap Esq. C.E.
No. 1 Range (Chingleput Distt)

Island Overseer's explanation
No. 189 15 July 1871

To
W. A. Goodchap Esq. C.E.
Executive Engineer in Charge No. 1
Range (Chingleput Distt)

Sir
I beg respectfully to acknowledge receipt of your Memo No. 336 of the 4th instant and in reply to state that the construction of a sluice to the Pallapandy Tank therein alluded to, was first entrusted to Contractor Alwar Shetty who not having attended to it until nearly the close of the official year the work was withdrawn from him and given over to one Rannu-asoolo Springan of the neighbouring Village of Panayurjerry. Having received a report from the latter individual and the Maistry employed thereon just at the close of the official year

year when I was under pressure by you to close
my accounts for early submission to the Controller
that the work was completed, a certificate to
that effect was made out confiding in the
report of the Contractor as in the case of few others,
want of time, as you are aware having prevented
my inspection of the work previously, the estimated
amount, however being lodged in your office
my close attendance moreover on the Resumption
examined, a work of comparatively greater
magnitude; sadly prevented my attention
being ^{given} to any other especially, as I was hanging
on the end of the official year, and the above
work was required to be completed before
preparation of my accounts.

On your setting out subsequently on the
29th April 1871 on a tour of inspection accompanied
by myself you proceeded on inspecting the works,
the estimated amounts of which have been
reserved and disbursements made on
examination of the said works; on arriving
at the Pallapandy Tank the work having
struck me as well as yourself as not having

been done to the extent reported by the
Contractor, a revised certificate specifying the
actual extent to which the work was performed
was on your orders, forwarded in substitution
of the one previously sent and payment made
to the Contractor accordingly.

In conclusion I beg to submit that
I was not actuated by any unfair feelings in
the matter in question, and as you are well
aware of the correctness and diligence with
which I have always discharged my duties
and this being the only instance in which I
failed in the confidence I have reposed on
the Contractor I respectfully beg you will be
so good as to lay this circumstance before the
Superintending Engineer as it occurred and
have me excused as you perfectly understand
it in all its details.

I beg to remain, Sir, Dear
Yours,
J. Stranvafool
Overseer S.P.W.

(True copy)
W. Goddard, Executive Engineer
No. 1 Range Chingleput District

No. 1841 Memorandum

The Superintending Engineer resolves to dispruse with the services of Sahib Overseer Strainiafooos Maidoo from the date of receipt of this order and Mr. Goodchap will make arrangements for taking over charge of his office at once, until the arrival of the Overseer who will be sent to relieve him.

The plain facts of the case are that the Overseer signed a certificate for constructing Rallapandy Tank sluice stating that according to measurements it was 10 yds long and that the cost of the work was Rupees 95. This certificate is dated the 31st March 1871 and the note at bottom of the certificate runs thus

"verified that the preceding claim is correct that the measurements have been made by me and that the work has been satisfactorily performed"

A petition was ^{then} sent up to Range Office on which a revised completion report was submitted on the 26th June the petition being dated

P.R. 5636/71

dated 2nd June 1871 The revised completion certificate is for Rs. 57 only and though a similar certificate at foot as that already quoted has been entered, still the Superintending Engineer cannot believe that the Overseer measured up the work at all. The only excuse that the Overseer makes is that he had a press of business and that therefore he believed the contractor and signed the certificate.

The Superintending Engineer sees no reason for taking a second view of the case, as to him it is a clear case of attempted fraud, which was only prevented by the petition coming in and he therefore resolves to dismiss the Overseer. —

Supdt. Engr of Calcutta Division
31st July 1871
Signed C. V. Wilkerson Col. R.E.
Superintending Engineer
/ True extract /

L. Goodchap Executive Engineer
No. 1 Pans (Chung) put street.

Let's see if I can find it

P. W. Brown's copy 1/22 L. 12

Copy of papers given by the Executive
Councillor in charge No. 1 Range to Strunwafooloo
Kadoo late Taluk's Overseer (single put Diett)
bearing upon a complaint made against
him regarding certificates granted for
reclaiming a slice in the Pallaandy Land
Truillone Taluk.

dated 2nd June 1871 The revised completion

No. 448

From

To

Sir

No. 1 Range Office
Soolar 2nd August 1871

W. H. Goodchap Esq.

Executive Engineer No. 1 Range
Chingaleput Dist.

Colonel, F. V. Wilkeson R.E.

Supg. Engineer 4th Division

I have the honor to acknowledge
the receipt of your Memo No. 1841 dated
31st July 1871 and, in reply, to state that your
dismissal order has been communicated
to Overseer Strainwafsooboo Kaidoo, who will
be relieved of his charge on the 3rd instant

Adverting to the observations in paras
2
4 & 5, it appears to me that the opinion
therein expressed has been arrived at under
a misapprehension of the intention of paras
3 & 4 of my letter No. 378 dated 18th ultimo.
On reference to those paragraphs, it will
be seen that, I stated, in the clearest
possible terms, that the Overseer was, in
no way justified in granting a certificate
for

for a work before it had been carefully
measured by him - at the same time,
I remarked, with reference to the Overseer's
plea that his certificate had been granted
prior to measurement of work, in consequence
of his having been busily engaged in
closing his accounts for 1870/71, that it was
just possible that this course had been
adopted without any dishonest motive.
The last clause of my letter was rather
loosely worded, but comparing it with
the context, it will be seen that my
reference was to the statement made by
the Overseer, and not to the line of action
which he had adopted, and which every
one will admit is open to the gravest
objection.

In conclusion I beg leave to
remark that I have always placed the
greatest stress upon the importance of the
certificates which are furnished in support
of outlay, and there is no case in which I

No. 189. 15th July 1871.

have granted, or knowingly permitted an
Overseer to grant, a certificate before work
had been carefully and fully measured up.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most Obedt. Servant
L. H. Goodchaffers Esq. Engineer
No. 1, Rainsburgh Street
District

No. 189. 15th July 1871.



To

W. A. Goodchap Esq.
Executive Engineer &c.
Bangalore District

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your Memo No. 236 of the 4th Instant and in reply to state that the construction of a sluice to the Pallepady Lake therein alluded to, was first entrusted to Contractor Munnichetty who not having attended to it until nearly the close of the official year, the work was withdrawn from him and given over to one Ramamuraja Syengar of the neighbouring village of Panayanjan. Having received a report from the latter individual and the Maistry employed thereon just at the close of the official year when I was under pressure by you to close my accounts for early submission to the Controller that the work was completed, a certificate to that effect was made out conforming in the report of the Contractor as in the case of a few others, want of time, as you are aware, having prevented my inspection of the work previously - the estimated amounts however, being lodged in your office.

Yours faithfully,
M. J.

I have

The Secy to the
No. 10 Bangalore

W. A. Goodchap Esq.
Bangalore District

By the Division

Dated 22nd August 71

(P. N. 5056/71)

No. 446

Offering my explanation with reference to the observations made by the Engineer in para 4, 8 & 9 of his Memo No. 236 dated 31st July 1871

Yours faithfully,
M. J.

My close attendance ministered
on the Casuarina Avenue, a work of comparatively
great magnitude, sadly prevented my attention
being directed to any other, especially as I was
having on the end of the official year, and
the above work was required to be completed,
before preparation of my accounts.

On your letting out subsequently
on the 29th April 1871, a team of inspection accom-
panied by myself, you proceeded on inspecting
the works, the estimated amount of which have
been retained and disbursements made on ex-
amination of the said works, arriving at the
Pallisady Tank, the work having struck me
as well as yourself as not having been done to
the extent reported by the contractor, a revised
certificate specifying the actual extent to which
the work was performed was on your orders,
forwarded in substitution of the one previously
sent and payment made to the contractor
accordingly.

On conclusion I beg to submit
that I was not actuated by any unfair feeling
in the matter in question, and as you are well
aware of the correctness and diligence with which
I have always discharged my duties, and this being
the only instance in which I failed in the
confidence

No 878
18th July 1871
Range of office

confidence I have reposed on the contractor,
I respectfully beg you will be so good as to lay
this circumstance before the Superintending Engineer
as it occurred and have me excused as you
perfectly understand it in all details.

They to Remain
Yours most Obedt Servant

Thomas D. P. W.

My close attendance monies:

No. 378.

Frou

To the Range Office
Carroll 18 July 1871

W. H. Goodchap Esq

Coconut *Angus* *N. 1* *Range*
Shunglup *Range*

L

Colonel. J. T. Wilkinson ^{Chungking} ^{Y.B.}
Supp. Engineer 4th Div.

21

With reference to your Proceedings

Enclosure

No. 1432 dated 3rd July 1871 I have the honor

1 Original Expt to enclose Taling Quersier Streuv. also too
2 notation

made no explanation of his reasons, for granting
 and signing two different certificates for a
 slave constructed in the Rallapandy Tanch
 him as therein requested, and to observe

1st That the Overseer, as stated in para
2 of his letter was closely engaged in
superintending the Hesmerian ancient
improvements and repairs up to the end of
last official year. -

2nd That the Overseer, as stated in para
3 of his letter did express surprise on
my examination with him of the
Pallapandy Land & twice on the 29th April,
when

when

Of course,

W. Thurnwald
Stuttgart. P. M.

2

W. J. Vandenberg

Greenland Engraving

Ad. I. George Thompson

Feb 15/97

July 1897

From David

1899

P. H. 5636/71

Stadiums and Explanations

Regarding the Chinese species

— Continued —

~~Confidence~~

when the Tunnel of the sluice was found
to be only six yards in length instead of ten.

3rd That the Overseer's statement in para 4
that he was not actuated by any dishonest
feeling in granting the 1st certificate I am
inclined to believe, inasmuch as he
was warned that no money would be
disbursed for new masonry work until
reexamined and measured by the Range
Officer.

2nd I beg respectfully to request it to be
understood that I do not for a moment from
the above observation consider an Overseer,
under any circumstances, justified in granting
a certificate for a work before carefully
measuring it, but I may here remark, there
was a pressure put upon Strunwalsoo Lookaidoo
for his accounts for March, and it is just
possible that, the course he states he pursued
with reference to the 1st certificate is correct,
and ^{that} it was granted with no dishonest
motive.

I have the honor to be

Sir
Your Most Obedt. Servant
W. P. Gorchaples Engineer
No. 10, Range, Changleput District

W. T. Gortchaff
No. 11, Canal Street District

2. *l*

2. I have the honor to report that,
Taluk Overseer Struniasooloo Kaidoo has been
called upon for full particulars of his reasons
for signing two different certificates for
slaves constructed in the Pullapandy Taluk
as requested in the Memorandum above
recorded.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Yours Most Obedt. Servant

W. Goodchap Esq. Engineer

No. 1 Range Chingleput
District

No 381

No. 1 Range Chingleput

No. 381

From

To

No. 1 Range Office
Sunder 25 July 1872

Mr Hoodehapp Esq.

Executive Engineer No. 1 Range
Chingleput District

Colonel. C. V. Wilkison R.E.
Superintending Engineer Division

Enclo 4 Sir

1 orig. Labours

1 do. report

1 do. minute

1 Village's Mahazar

1 do. report

1 do. minute

I have the honor to enclose the result of the Magistrate's enquiry with reference to the Rallaipandy Tank's sluice and as the case has been dismissed by him under section 67 of Civil Procedure Code I have this day forwarded a completion certificate to the Controller of Public Works Accounts for the work in question.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your Most Obedt Servant
C. Hoodehapp Esq.

No. 1 Range Chingleput District

From

The Executive Engineer

No. 1 Range

Chingleput District

To

The Supt. Engineer

4 Range

Dated 5th

July 13/71

P. W. 5630/71.

No. 342

Received

Marking our observation on
a minute made by the
Supt. Engineer in his memo No. 1432
of 3rd inst. and reporting that
Talaji Sureswar Srinivasachari
has been requested to supply
full particulars of his reasons
for granting two certificates for
sluice constructed in the
Rallaipandy Tank.

4 August 71

Dr

W. B. Goodchap Esq.

Deputy Engineer in Charge N.E. District

Sir -

I beg to be favored the copies
of correspondence taken place between
you and the Superintending Engineer
regarding my dismissal

Very respectfully

Sir
Yours most obedt Servant

Wm. B. Goodchap

enquiry

W-1/10

W. B. Goodchap

is required to inform

if he has seen the

all of the day about

the office and whether

he considers the

foundations to be

sound or not

W. B.

27-1/11

From

The Lee Engineer

Co. 10th Regt

Long Point

To

Mr. J. H. Lawrence

4 June

Colo 20

Rec

P. M. 5637

No 381

Rec'd 4

Forwarded a Report from

the Engineer of the structure

along with the same enclosed

to the Adjutant General

W. B.

Requests to be forwarded
the copies of correspondence
take place for dismission

question is of new construction.
While the case is such one (Grover & Gary
(Villagers of Panay, Gary)) presented a petition to the
effect that the contractor has deceived by
and recommending the old construction, and
Sergeant

enquiry I found, that as some misunderstanding exists between the Contractor and Petitioner from a long time, to be not believed and as the investigation of which does not lie in my power I have discharged the case under Section 67 of Civil Procedure Code.

Considering to inform you after having obtained information from the Contractor in person, I send for him, he was found but not attended.

I beg to enclose a report from the Revenue Inspector and Mahazarnama given by the Villagers for your information to the effect that the construction of the Shiva is of new character.

Signed Nazimuddin Sahib
Magistrate of Simlone
Lahore

(True Translation)

Per Enquiry

No. 1 Dany Shingput Lere

P. H. 566/71

Ref. 14 July 1911
1871
17
[The following text is a dense, handwritten document in Devanagari script, likely a legal or official record. It contains numerous lines of text, some of which are crossed out or underlined. The script is highly stylized and difficult to transcribe accurately without specialized knowledge of the language.]

Ernst

31/5/5

[illegible]

11-1-50

N. 436

How

1st Regt. Cavalry
Camp Kansas July 1871

W. H. Lyndehead, Esq.

Executive Engineer, 1st Regt.

Chapin's District

Colonel A. T. Holbrook, U.S.

Superintending Engineer & Engineer

With reference to your proceedings of 17th
dated 27th instant requesting me to report if I had
seen the Pallasquerra & Burke sluices and whether

I considered the foundation to be new or old. I
have the honor to state that, I have already reported
in my letter marginally noted that, "I examined the
sluices on the 29th April 1871 and it struck me at
the time that the flooring to the tunnel pointed
old in comparison with the other portion of the
work." I beg to observe that, I inspected the sluices
again on the 29th instant and my opinion remains
the same. viz: that, the flooring to the tunnel of old
sluices was not removed and that, the present foundation

P. 57. 56. 56/72

* N. 319 dated 20 June 1871
Cubing at 5.30
P. 11-10-8

to tunnel is old:—

I have to remark that I noted on the 29th
that, the quantity of debris from the old
shuice, collected on the work, was very small and
that fact, confirmed me in my opinion that,
the old flooring had not been removed.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obedt Servt

L. B. Goodchap ^{Executive Engineer}
Major General's District

to tunnel is old:—

This has now
been disposed of
by the dismissal
of the oversaw

From
The Executive Engineer
No 1 Range Chingleput Dist
To Mr. D. H. M. Esq.
The Superintending Engineer
4th Division

Dated 31 July 1871
Recd.

No 456
P. W. 5636/71.
Reports that the flooring
to the Tunnel of Pallapandy
Sunk sluice appeared old in
Comparison with the other
portion of the work on the
examination of the sluice
on the 29th April & July 1871—
From

No 456

From

No 1 Range Office
Suppason 5th August 1871
53
W. A. Goodchap Esq.
Executive Engineer
No 1 Range Chingleput Dist

Colonel C. V. Walker Esq.
Superintending Engineer 4th Div.

Enclosure
1 Original Application

Sir
As I have received the enclosed
application from Streenevator Kadoo for a
Copy of the correspondence regarding his dismissal
from the Department I have the honor to request
you will be good enough to inform me, if I have
your permission to comply with his request

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your Most Obedt Servt

W. A. Goodchap Esq.
Executive Engineer
No 1 Range Chingleput Dist

No. 1 Range Office
Tues. 20th November 1871

No. 810

From

W. A. Goodchap Esq^r

Executive Engineer No. 1 Range
Chungking Dist.

Colonel F. T. Wilkinson R.E.

Supy. Engineer 4th Division

Sir

Enclo 5

4 contract certificates

1 copy of papers

Glenn Blake Esq^r

Overseer Chungking Dist.

With reference to a copy of a
Memorandum No. 92 dated 14th November/71
from the Secretary to Government in the
Public Works Department and your
Proceedings No. 3345 dated 15th inst. and
attached. I have the honor to state that it
is not unusual in this Range to reserve
cheques drawn in favor of Contractors in the
last month of the official year, pending
examination of works by Range Officers. These
cheques are made out for sums shown to be
due for work done as per Contract certificates;
prepared by the Overseers, and as the payments
are, as a rule, final, I have always felt a
hesitation

From

The Executive Engineer

To

1st Range Officer
The Chungking Dist.

1st Division

20-11-71

W. A. Goodchap

Executive Engineer

No. 1 Range

Chungking Dist.

Colonel F. T. Wilkinson

R.E.

Supy. Engineer

4th Division

Glenn Blake Esq^r

Overseer Chungking Dist.

20-11-71

W. A. Goodchap

No. 1156

Enclosure 1

P. O. No. 5636/71

Requests to be informed

if he is to comply with the

request for copy of the

papers connected with the

claimant.

hesitation in handing the cheques, prior to inspection, to the Contractors. - In issuing the cheques and entering their amounts as disbursements, I have always regarded the transactions as bona fide, supported as they were by the Overseer's contract certificates; but, for the interest of Government, and in order to the exercise of that check which the Comptroller very properly expects Range Officers to maintain over disbursements in their Ranges and particularly over such as represent final payments, I have withheld the formal delivery of the cheques to the parties concerned, till I felt satisfied that Government had received a fair amount of work for their money. -

2. In all these cases, the works for which the cheques are drawn are shown by the Overseers to have been executed in the year in which the transactions appear in my accounts

accounts, and the only informality in my arrangement consists in the withholding of the cheques to the parties in whose favor they are issued, till I have satisfied myself of the work done. -

3. The practice to which allusion is here made obtains only in the last month of the official year, and then increases in which final payments are made; - hence if the check-book exercise is not to be maintained, there will be no means of obtaining refunds of money alleged to be due to contractors by the Overseers, but which on examination the Range Officers may find not to be the case. -

4. The cheques drawn in March, are invariably paid away, or the transactions adjusted before the end of April when the Range Officers' examinations are concluded, and any corrections that may

that be necessary in the accounts are made
under instructions from the Controller. In
the case of work paid for in any other than
the last month of the official year, portions
of the claims are withheld as per contract
certificates herewith sent.

5 I beg to enclose a copy of papers
given to Stevedore J. S. O. Kaidoo in the reference
to your Proceedings No. 1965 dated 7th August 1891
and to report that { Execution Engineer's letter S. 11342
the letters withheld { 378, 381, 446, 456 dated 5th 18th 20th
of July 22nd 23rd of August 1891 Supp. Engineer
Memo No. 1965 dated 7th August 1891
from him are noted in the margin.

I have the honor to be ..

Sir

Your most Obedt. Servant

C. H. Goodchap Execution Engineer

No. 1 Range Chung Le Suei Dist.

that be necessary in the mind of the

From
The Asst Engineer
N. S. P. P. P.
Chunglepud, Distt.
To
The Supg. Engineer
4th Division

Dated 20th }
Recd } November 1871
P. M. 5536/71
No. 810

Encls 5
Reporting on the practice
existing in the Range of
reserving cheques, at the close of
the official year, drawn in
favor of contractors till the
Range of final inspection
and sending copy of papers
given to Shreea Koolas P. P. P.
to be kept, under Chunglepud Distt.

N^o 3475
Superintending Engineer
4th Division
Madras 24 November 1871

From
Colonel G. V. Wilkieson M.E.
Superintending Engineer
4th Division
To
Colonel J. Carpendale M.E.
Secretary to Government
M. Department

Sir
Enclosures. Adverting to para 1 of your
Memo. N^o 92 dated 14th November
1. Letter from Mr. Goodchap
M. P. P. P. N^o 810 1871, requesting me to report on the
dated 20th Nov 1871, with 11 acco^{ts}
- payments. - practice alleged to prevail in the
Range Chunglepud District of entering
- monies in the Range Accounts as
- bona fide disbursements and of
- reserving portions of such monies
- for payments after actual execution
- and examination of work, I have
the

the honor to enclose an original letter from Mr. Goodchap the Precinct Engineer in charge of the Range, in which he clearly explains the course of business generally adopted by him in making payments for work executed on contract or otherwise.

2. It will be observed that payments are invariably made in cheques which are generally delivered at once to the parties concerned. It has however not been unusual to withhold in some instances, the cheques drawn in the last month of the official year, until the Range Officer had time to examine the works, and this system appears to me to be a good one, as it allows of deductions being made if necessary on account of shortcomings on the part

part of Contractors. It will be utterly impossible for a Range Officer to visit all the work done up to the last day of the official year, and then to draw up cheques to a ditch of adjustment in the accounts of the year.

3. In reference to para. 2 of your Memo under reply, I beg to state that all the papers connected with the Overseer Shreevafooloo's case were furnished, except those which would be of no use to him. The papers furnished, as well as those withheld, are herewith sent for the information of Government.

In my letter N^o 1743 dated 21st August last, embodied in Government Order, N^o 2122, dated 18th August 1871, I clearly stated the

the grounds on which Steene-
waspoo & Aidoo merited
dismissal; I would now
strongly deprecate the re-entertain-
ment of the man who has
shewn himself so untrustworthy,
and whose conduct has so
frequently been condemned by
my Predecessors, and by the
Range Officers under whom he
served. The charge of which ^{Mr. Leggat} ^{Mr. Gladstone}
the accused was found guilty
was in my opinion a deliberate
fraud, and further in Para 5 of
my letter to Government reporting
the circumstances it will be seen
that the bill which was passed
for Rupees 57 is not correct, as a
foundation is included in it, whilst
the sluice was built on the old
foundation.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant
Wm. H. Wilson Col. R.E.
Superintendent of the Division

retained till the works -
have

Bo. 19 Aug 171 219-220
- 16 Nov - 72 Nov

P.O. No. 1871 The post
office of Govt for the
town "No. 5636"
The Superintendent
H. C. ...

To The Secretary of Government
Wm. Crockett

Dated 25
Recd 23 November 1871

Page: 21/11

Em: 21.11
c. 3475.

Aug. 4. Sunny 72.

Sept 11. 1847
Submitting an original
Letter from a Mr Goodrich
Secretary Engineer & R. H. May
of New York District con-
firming the correctness
of the generally adopted
by him in making
payments for water
rights to Dr. Carter
a statement and showing
discrepancies the recent
members of the Association
have had no objection

Yours Most Obedient Servant
Wm. H. Harrison Col. Regt.
Supt Engineer 4th Division

From the Ldg Engineer &c / H. B. 18.34/75 d/24: November/71

no notice is taken here of the
disposal of the over-ear
thermo-analor - Kaidoo.
is connected with the practice
referred to. I would like to know
if the disposal is to be maintained.

From the above letter and its enclosure the Government observe that a practice prevails in the Chingleput Range, of issuing Cheques in the last month of the Official year for work slated to be completed by Overseers and that these Cheques are not handed over to the Contractors but are retained till the works have

have been examined by the
Range Officer. In order,
however, that the amounts of
these Cheques may be debited
to the expenditure of the
year in which the Cheques
are issued, it is necessary
that the Contract Certifica-
tes shall be signed by
the Contractor and be
dated in March while the
Cheques are not handed
over to him till the following
year. Thus an acknow-
ledgment of the receipt of
an amount is obtained
from a Contractor some
days or perhaps weeks before
the Contractor is actually
paid and in cases in which

the works for which Cheques
have been issued, are not
found to have been ex-
ecuted in a satisfactory
manner or to the extent
specified in the Contract
Certificate, it is stated
that corrections are made
under instructions from
the Controller. As the
Cheques are issued in
the name of the Contractor
and Cheques are stated
to be withheld only when
issued in final payment
for works, it is clear
that the sum to be
recovered can only be
obtained by calling upon
the Contractor to cash

the Cheque and to refund
a portion of the amount of
by having the Cheque can-
celled and another Cheque
issued for a smaller amount;
in either case the Contrac-
tor might refuse to receive
a smaller sum than that
for which he had granted
a receipt and he might
make good his claim by
an appeal to the law, on
the grounds that work to
the amount for which he
had granted a receipt
had been certified to or
been passed by a competent
member of the Public
Works Department, leaving
the claim against him
to

to be adjusted by the
Overseer who had passed
a Certificate in respect of
work done or for inferior
work which the Range
Officer refused to pass.
It is not right or desi-
rable that a Range
Officer should place him-
self in a false position
and that all transac-
tions between himself
and Contractors should
not be of a beneficial
character, and be clearly
and undubitably correct
and straightforward.
If an Overseer finds
that the Range Officer
will accept a receipt for
money

money which is not paid
in order that funds may
be got rid of at the
close of an official year
and may not be lost to
the District, he may think
it not unadvisable or
improper to go a step
further and to certify
to a work being completed
when it is not so and
urge in justification that
he was aware that no
loss would be incurred
as the work could not be
actually paid for till it
had been examined by
a competent Officer. In
fact such a plea has re-
cently been put forward
by

by an Overseer who⁵³
charged with furnish-
ing a false completion
Certificate.

The official
year terminates in
the middle of the work-
ing season and a
large number of works
must then be in pro-
gress, and work execu-
ted up to the 31st March
cannot possibly be paid
for in full. It is of
course desirable that
completed works should
be paid for and that
large balances should
not be due to Contractors
for works in progress

at the close of the official
year.

There are few Ranges
in which a Range
Officer could not examine
and pass all the work
executed by the 15th March
before the end of the
month and hence at
the end of the year sums
need not be due for any
work for more than 15
days at the most, while
for the work examined
later in the month -
hardly any thing could
be due. Under those cir-
cumstances the Governor
in Council directs that
for completed work -
completion

Completion Certificates -
shall be furnished and
that Cheques shall be
issued only for work
which has been passed
by the Range Officer
and that the Cheques
shall be duly delivered
to Contractors on the
date of their issue, when
the Completion Certifi-
cates are signed by
the Contractors.

It is observed
that the expenditure
on Agricultural re-
pairs especially in
the last month of
the year is very large
indeed, and that this
me

may in some instances
be due to the large
quantity of work execu-
ted from January to
March there is reason
to believe that, in some
Districts at least, the
reprehensible practice of
issuing Cheques for works
which have not been
examined or completed
prevails, and that Cheques
thus issued are frequently
retained in the Cash
Chests for considerable
periods: all Superintending
Engineers are directed
to put a stop to this
practice where it prevails
and in order that no
funds

funds may be lost to
the Presidency the
Superintending Engineers
in reporting which
sums they would
wish to surrender
from the allotments
for Agricultural &
Repairs in Febru-

-ary as directed
in G.O. Nos 3 dated
18th November will bear
in mind that Cheques
may no longer be
issued for works and
be retained in the
Range Offices.

To Messrs. Engrs.
Major R. D. Kennedy
Controller P. M. A.
Chief Eng^r for Irrigation

Dec 25/1/72

J. T.
8 D.R.

Op 5635.

Govt. of (1871) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To The Superintending
Engineers

Date

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 4th Jan 1872 No. 4.

Nos. 129/13

Instructions to Control
For - When orders are
issued from the Superintending
Engineer to the District
Engineers to execute
work in connection
with