

(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.	2461	Press
B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated	31-8	195
		2874

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
31st August 1874.*

Read the following:—

No. 733. From the District Engineer, Bellary, dated 21st May 1874, No. 225.
ABSTRACT.—Reporting on the memorial of Supervisor Claridge praying for the cancelment of the order reducing him to 2nd grade Overseer.

No. 734. ORDER THEREON, 31st August 1874, No. 2,461.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 53.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has again attentively considered the case of Mr. Overseer Claridge and

sees no reason to modify the decisions before arrived at.

2. It is observed that Mr. Claridge's claims to travelling allowance are open to appeal to the Chief Engineer, through the District Engineers of Bellary and Kurnool, such claims should be supported by the necessary Inspection Lists and Bills.

3. But the insolent and unjustifiable charges brought against the District Engineer in the memorial addressed by Mr. Claridge, in spite of a well known regulation, direct to Government, merit the severest notice; and His Excellency the Governor in Council accordingly directs that Mr. Claridge be reduced from the 2nd to the 3rd grade for a period of twelve months.

4. His transfer from the Bellary to the Kurnool District has already been ordered.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the Superintending Engineer, Bellary.

„ District Engineer, Kurnool.

„ Officiating Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.

Spare Copies

unfounded

into the
question of No 24. I am, therefore, inclined
that the fact of a reduction of the allotment
at the end of the year is necessary. That
the question for the Supervisor had ex-
ceeded the original allotment by following
work to be done some extent that there
Subsequently valued at No. 3902.

3. The Supervisor questions the correct-
ness of the above sum, and states that
within his knowledge, the total amount
due was only No. 2424. On this I may
remark that I examined the claim very
carefully, and went through everything in
the Abstract. The chief item in the dis-
ference of the two sums was a deduction
of No 1022 made by the Supervisor, but
allowed by me, after satisfying myself
as to the reasonableness of the Contractor's
claim. I would, however, observe that this
in no way affects the matter. The plain
fact exists that the Supervisor allowed the
year's allotment to be exceeded by a large
sum, and it is of no consequence whether
that

that sum was No 3902 or No 2424.

4. Referring to work done on the Road from
Beltway to Siquipad the Supervisor says that
he cannot be held responsible for work done
by the Contractor, without any orders from
the Supervisor. I find paragraph 2 of the
affidavit it will be seen that the Supervisor
measured in July 1892, work done by the
Contractor in April, May and June 1892.
Was not this a recognition of the fact that
the Contractor was working with the Super-
visor's approval? Why did not the Super-
visor report the matter, and stop work, until
he received instructions as to how to deal
with the Contractor, pending an allotment
of funds?

5. The Supervisor questions my acceptance
of Oliver Chang's measurements, in preference
to the Supervisor's measurements or those
of Mr. Maudslowiak, and he points out that
I accepted the measurements of one admitted
to be "very inexperienced at the time." On this
I

I would remark that almost all the previous payments to the extent of Rs. 9740 were made by the Supervisor's Measurements and Bills prepared by Messrs. (Messrs.) The correctness of each Bill is certified by the Supervisor without exception. There is nothing remarkable in my founding my calculations on Measurements taken by the same Messrs.

6. The calculations founded on these measurements gave Rs. 6621, as the value of the work done. The Supervisor questions the correctness of this sum, I would, however, again observe that this in no way affects the matter. The plain fact is that the Supervisor allowed work to be done without allotment, work valued at a very large sum, and it is of no consequence whether that sum was Rs. 6621 or Rs. 10738.

7. With reference to paragraph 3 of the appeal - I shall dispose of its entire inaccuracy

inaccuracy in a very few words.

The statement that I described Messrs. Dunder as "very inexperienced at the time" is simply false - no reference whatever is made to the inexperience of that Messrs. in my letter to Government. The statement that the Supervisor's measurements on the Road from Bellary to Maidoor were checked by Mr. Montserrat, and the accuracy of those measurements fully established is equally false - No measurements on this Road were made by Mr. Montserrat.

8. I would call your attention to the conspicuous fact throughout the appeal, that the Supervisor knowing perfectly well that he cannot escape from the charge of having done work greatly in excess of allotment, endeavours to draw off attention from that charge by repeated references to the differences of value that have been arrived at for work done in the above named instances. The plain fact is that the Supervisor having assumed the responsibility of allowing

allowing work to be done in anticipation
of allotment, and having found himself
in a critical position because there was no
allotment, endeavoring to reduce the amount
due the Contractors for work done on the
mistaken supposition that the amount
of blame to be attached to him will be
reduced, by diminishing the value of the
work done without authority. It goes to your
information, Mr. Montross, that I am
in this subject. From what I saw in the
"in the matter, it appears to me that the
"Charge allowed the work to be carried
"out in anticipation of getting an allotment
"and seeing that the expectations were
"failed, he tries to reduce the amount
"of work done."

9. Referring to the claim of Contractor
Mr. Sait. I would remark that the
Supervisor's attempt to avoid responsi-
bility, because the work was not ordered
by him, but by Oliver Pearson is

very

very frivolous. The Owners Memorandum
is initialed by the Supervisor, which sim-
ple fact at once disposes of the question
of responsibility.

The details connected with Mr. Sait's claim
have been so thoroughly examined by
yourself, that I do not feel that I can
throw any further light on the matter.

I would however remark on the amount
of dispendence that may be placed on the
Statements made in paragraph 6 of the
"appeal, by observing that the amount
claimed by the Contractor as the balance
due on the 11th & 12th Miles is No. 60 and
not No. 300, as stated by the Supervisor.

10. In the concluding clause of paragraph
6 of the appeal, the Supervisor asks to be
pardonned for saying that the method
adopted by me for settling Mr. Sait's
claim is the most extraordinary method
that has ever been resorted to by the P.W.D.
On this I would merely remark that the

the method met with your prompt and hearty approval; it is therefore a matter of supreme indifference to me what the Supervisor's opinion is as to my method of working or any to.

While writing this report I have received the accompanying letter and petition from the Supervisor, and at his request, I forward them for your perusal. He appears to think that the petition has an important bearing on his appeal. To me it seems an additional proof of the Supervisor's extreme irregularity.

11. The statement in paragraph 7 of the appeal, can be at once disposed of, and its accuracy estimated, by a reference to the very documents to which the Supervisor calls attention. The Bill (appears to be C) is for work executed during the months of May and June 1892, and was paid for, according to the Supervisor's

own statement, on the 28th August 1892. The sum of Rs 300 is claimed for work done under orders dated the 24th September 1892. Vide paragraphs 2 and 3 of Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 417 dated 3rd November 1893. What connection, I would ask, has a Bill for work done in May and June, and paid for in August, with a claim for work ordered to be done in September?

This amount was not added to the bill, but was paid by the Supervisor.

12. In your pencil remark opposite to paragraph 8 of the appeal you ask, "why were not the sums of Rs. 26⁰ 9⁰ 4 and Rs. 25, distinctly shown in the final payment of Rs. 95⁰ 10⁰ 0 which is said to include them"? To this I would reply, because the Bill for Rs. 95⁰ 10⁰ 0 referred to by the Supervisor, is for work executed during April 1892. Whereas the sums above claimed are, the former on account of balance due for work performed in July 1891, and the latter for 100 Cubic Yards

Yards of gravel taken by Departmental
Maistry since 1st December 1891. This
of the Bill (Appendix D) has nothing
whatever to do with the particulars
of charges for which the sum of Rs.
26,947 and Rs. 25 are claimed.

13. In paragraph of the appeal the
Supervisor makes much of the fact that
though I was distinctly directed by the
to call upon him to explain why the
Rs 26,947 had remained unpaid, yet he
in the mind was done by me. On this
I would remark that your Memorandum

11. No. 1119 dated 30 November 1893 was re-
ceived in my Office on the 6th of the same
month. The original paper coincides
with Mr. Sait's claim, viz. by a
coincidence (after a very long delay) on
the part of the late Mr. Sait's account
in my Office on the following day.
As I was directed in your Memorandum
dated 1st June to come to terms with Mr. Sait

as promptly as possible, and as I now had
the original papers from the late Mr.
Sait in my possession, I wished to
avoid the delay that would occur by a
reference to the Supervisor, and there-
fore disposed of the matter as reported
in my letter No. 1368 dated 11 November
1893.

When I inform you that, with refer-
ence to this claim, the Supervisor has
made the following statements on three
separate occasions, I shall leave it to
you to determine what the probable
value of his explanation would have been.
I enclose No. 1119 dated 11 March 1893,
the Supervisor states that he is not
aware of any sums being due to Contractor
Mr. Sait for work done. In a letter, volu-
me number, dated 20 February 1894 (after
the Supervisor had been informed that
the sum of Rs 200 paid by the Contractor
would

would be recovered from the Supervisor's Salary) it is admitted that a sum of \$206 is due to the Contractor - (Secondly, in passing, call attention to the close coincidence of the two sums, as being somewhat significant) - and now, in the appeal, it is declared that the Contractor has been paid in full.

14. Regarding the complaint in para-
graph 11 of the appeal, that the Super-
visor has on certain occasions received only
30 Ropes a month instead of Travelling
allowance. - I would remark, that these
severe measures were very necessary for
bringing the Supervisor to a sense of his
duty, and arose from the fact of his
having distinctly disobeyed the orders of
his Range Officer, and from his having
behaved in a grossly insubordinate man-
ner towards that Officer. I desire that
Supervisors

Supervisors and Officers in this District
look upon their Travelling allowance as
a part of their pay, and consider that
they have been paid if full Travelling
allowance is not passed to them, as a
matter of course, every month. I presume
that I am right in my interpretation
that these Subordinates have no claim
to Travelling allowance, but that it is
to be regulated according to their conduct
each month, and I trust that I shall
have the support of Government in this
opinion.

15. In the margin of his appeal, at paragraph 11, the Supervisor complains that he was never called upon to give an explanation. On this I would remark that in the case of Shaikh Erachind-clanis / which was by far the most important / numerous papers were in my possession, proving the plain fact

fact that money was sent to the
contractor, for work done without authority.
no explanation was therefore needed.

I have already (in paragraph 13) men-
tioned in detail the explanatory state-
ments made by the Supervisor regarding
Contractor Mr. Sack's claim.

The Supervisor also complains that his
was not supplied with a copy of your
Memorandum No. 414 dated 3rd December

1893 - which he applied for on the 5th
February 1894. I saw no person for
supplying him with the Memorandum

as you had long previously dis-
posed of Mr. Sack's claim, in reply
to my letter No. 1368 dated 11 November

1893. The Supervisor again complains
that when a copy of G.O. No. 145 dated 27th
January 1894, was sent to him, the en-
closing course was omitted. On this

would remark that no Extract from
that Order (not a copy) was sent to the
Supervisor.

quite sufficient

9
Beltway Range Office - and the enclosing
course was omitted as in no way bearing
on the instructions that accompanied
the Extract. A copy of this Extract was
sent by the Range Office to the Supervisor.
When printed copies of the order were re-
ceived, a copy was sent for record to
the Range Office - and I presume that
the Supervisor there saw that copy, and
thought he would make capital of the
omission which I have now explained.

16. Having disposed in detail, of the
numerous excuses brought forward in
the appeal, and having in my reply,
studiously endeavoured to use the mildest
expressions when speaking of those ex-
cuses, I would now be most emphatically
to protest against the tone that the
Supervisor has thought fit to adopt
throughout the appeal, towards me and
towards my office. Established.

It is not to be understood that the
Should speak of the Clerk
in a District Inquirer's Office
given to "a process of cooking accounts."
It is ^{still} less endurable that the Clerk
Should give reasons for the un-
cedented act of sending a Government
direct to his dwelling the Governor of
a fact that he feared "let it should fail
to reach its destination through the
"peculiar notions of fairness" to a person
"who has no defense himself, which
"I am to be entertained by the District
Inquirer."
Had the offensive expressions
noted by the Supervisor
towards me as a private individual,
and towards the Clerk in my Office
towards the Clerk in a private Office
I should have taken the matter into
my

my own hands, and should, by a free
use of my horse-whip, have obtained
from the Supervisor an abject apology.

Situated as I am, however, I am
unable to adopt this summary and
satisfactory process, and I must there-
fore look to Government to protect me
from such violence and incursion,
as well as to protect my Clerk from being
so grossly vilified; and I would suggest
that the most thorough method for
preventing such conduct is to remove
individuals who dare to indulge in
it, and I would therefore indicate
the propriety of Supervisor Claridge's
immediate dismissal from the De-
partment.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obedt. Servant
Wm. R. R. R. R. R.
Off. District Inquirer

19-9-72

From, *P. W. 18 1/2 Dept.*
Dist. of Col. No. 3131.
The Superintending Engineer.

To, *3rd Division*
Bellary.

The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Fort Saint George

No. 225

Dated *25th May* 18*91*
Received *27* Enclos. 3

G.O. No. 2611. 31-8-74.
Request to accompany
Memorial from Super-
vised Charge to His
Excellency the Governor

Ch. 733
12/10/74
12/10/74

No 34. 4/4/5.

From

The Sub-Divisional Officer
Bellary Range.

To

The District Engineer
Bellary.

Sir,

I beg to forward herewith in original
a registered letter received on the 2nd instant,
from a man named Feeda Boosain who
performed some work on Smith Road to XVIII
in 1872 and was paid up for all the work
done by him. This man now asks me to settle
a large sum which he states to be due to
him for "Road works" and holds out threat
of bringing this matter before you if I do
not speedily settle with him. I have written
to him telling him he is at liberty to do so,

and

and I now bring this matter to your notice
and request that you will do me the great
favour of sending this letter to Government
as an appendix to my memorial as it
shows that what I anticipated at the
close of the 6th paragraph namely, that
the course adopted with reference to Ali
Saik's claim was "one likely to bring
forward a number of other equally
imaginary claims from contractors
in the hope of being equally successful
with Ali Saik" is already beginning to
come to pass.

As the above mentioned letter has
an important bearing on my memorial
I earnestly request that there be no
delay in forwarding it to the

Chief

Chief Engineer to be laid before
Government.

Very truly yours,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Bellary (Camp)

Dated 4th May 1874

Wm. H. Smith

Superintendent

Recd
2 May 1911

Mr. S. Glanville

Superintendent D. P. W.

Sir

Bellary

I am being given to understand that your honor is about to remove from this station I feel very sorry and hope your honor will not forget me but keep allways favor on me. I request your honor would be good enough before leaving the station kindly settle all my accounts which is long time due for Roads work and etc I have done by your order amount you know a large sum which you was promising me to this will be settled and now I beg you will be so good as to fulfill with your promise and I have waited on your word and according to request not to bring to notice of ^{higher} authority and I beg you will be good enough to settle this within a weeks time if not I intend to bring this ^{things} ~~very~~ before the District Engineer's office before you leaving

25. 7. 31/10/11
2/11/11
25. 7. 31/10/11

Bellary as I don't like to be loser my self
by doing ~~doing~~ this will be greater ~~bliss~~
awaiting for your earliest reply +

Bellary
27th April 1874

I am dear
your obedt. servt.
Teda Hesperian

n. b.

I hope you will consider every
thing deeply and make it settlement
7. 4.

M. 313/74.
 3
 P. 231 Aug 1/74
 18. 1. 133

Registered & stamped

100 LATE

Mr. S. Claridge
 District Engineer D. P. W.

Bellary District
 1/5/74

RECEIVED
 19 MAR 1874
 DISTRICT ENGINEER

100 LATE
 100 LATE

Repaying to little
 in claim fees

Bellary District
 1/5/74

100 LATE
 100 LATE

THE RIGHT HONORABLE THE GOVERNOR of Madras in Council.

The Humble Memorial of Samuel Claridge, Supervisor
 in the Department of Public Works, Bellary District.

RESPECTFULLY SHOWETH,

That with reference to the order of Government No. 194 A, dated 27th
 January 1874, your Memorialist begs to submit the following representations
 for your Lordship's consideration.

1. In letter No. 834 B from Captain A. Edgcome, Officiating District
 Engineer, to the Secretary to Government, Department of Public Works, great
 blame is attributed to your Memorialist for "allowing Contractors to do work
 so greatly in excess of the year's allotment," and he is declared to have thereby,
 "proved his unfitness to remain in the Department." No mention whatever is
 made of a fact which entirely exonerates your Memorialist on this head, in so
 far as the Raidrug Road is concerned, namely, that the allotment was reduced
 in the last month of that Official year by Rupees 4,000. Vide docket from Colonel
 Moberly No. 2333 dated 9th March 1872, in the margin;—

This amount would have covered the bill entered in Captain Edgcome's letter
 viz, Rupees 3902. This amount of Rupees 3902, arrived at after "careful calcu-
 lation, founded on measurements taken by Overseer Dennehy," is a most extra-
 ordinary one, inasmuch as it is within your Memorialist's knowledge that the
 total amount due was only Rupees 2721-0-2. What is meant by 'founded upon'
 your Memorialist is utterly unable to conceive. Does it refer to a process of
 cooking accounts adopted by the accountants in the District Engineer's Office? If
 not, how has the amount become increased by Rupees 1177-15-10? Surely the
 District Engineer has never closely examined these accounts, and ascertained
 their trustworthiness. With regard to the excess of work performed on the Siri-
 goopah Road, your Memorialist respectfully urges that he cannot justly be held
 responsible for an act of the Contractor's, done without any orders from your
 Memorialist. The work done by the Contractor was inspected and measured by
 your Memorialist in February 1872, and payment made to the Contractor on
 the 21st of the same month of Rupees 536. 2. 5.; and as the allotment for that
 Road was then found to be nearly worked out, the docket given in the margin,
 was sent to the Local Fund Overseer Mr. O'Leary, who was in special charge
 of the Road, forbidding the exceeding of the allotments by any amount. Under
 these circumstances, it is manifestly unjust to hold your Memorialist responsible
 for an act done by the Contractor without any directions or orders received
 from your Memorialist: and your Memorialist would respectfully beg your Lord-
 ship to consider for a moment, whether Contractor Sheik Ebraim, a man ac-
 quainted with English, and in the habit of taking contracts from the Commis-
 sariat and other Departments, as well as the Department of Public Works, could
 by any possibility have been ignorant of the amount allotted for the Sirigoopah
 Road, which had also been published in the District Gazette. Your Memoria-
 list respectfully urges that, before condemning him for a proceeding on the part
 of the Contractor in which he had no share, the former should have been called
 upon to produce any orders directing him to do work in excess of the allotment.
 But nothing of the kind has been done, or if done, all mention of it, is studiously
 avoided in Captain Edgcome's letter.

Informs that the balances on the undermentioned
 works are remaining to be spent during the month of
 March 1872, and requests to pay particular attention
 in not exceeding the allotments by any amount.

Name of Work.	Grant.	Expendi- ture up to end of Feb. 1872	Balance.
ORIGINAL.			
Road Bellary to Siri- goopah.	9787 8	9714 9 11	411 1
Do. Adoni to do.	4000	3961 3 3	38 12 9
REPAIRS.			
Bellary to Sirigoopah.	1680	1678 13 4	1 3 8
Sirigoopah to Adoni.	400	153 9 6	246 6 6
			261 4

16th May 1874
 District Engineer
 Bellary District

Informs that allotment of Rupees 11,000, sanc-
 tioned for expenditure on constructing Road from
 the 8th mile-stone of the Road from Bellary to Ban-
 galore, to Raidrug, has been reduced to Rupees 7,000
 with reference to Board's Proceedings No. 407 dated
 4th instant. Directs to stop all works on this road
 and to report at once of the amount of expenditure in-
 curred on the same up to date, as it is believed that
 you have exceeded the reduced grant by more than
 two thousand Rupees.

Side this Office do not 2. 116 dated
 20 March 1872

200 Rupees

In para 2 of his letter Captain Edgcome states "I would remark that the amount of Rupees 6621 for work done on the Road from Bellary to Sirigopah has been arrived at, after a careful calculation, founded on measurements taken by the late taluk Over-seer O'Leary and accepted by the Contractor."

* This amount of Rupees 6621, is one that calls for careful scrutiny. With reference to the Bills given by Mr. O'Leary to the contractor, your Memorialist found on examining the measurements book that many of the items had not been worked out and the cubic contents entered in the proper columns. The book was therefore returned to him to have this done; and when it was sent back to your Memorialist, it was accompanied by separate measurement sheets containing abstracts of each mile, and a General abstract was made in the last page, and the total amount arrived at was Rupees 4938-6-2 as due to the contractor. How this amount has swelled out into Rupees 6621, can be accounted for only by the accountants who made the 'careful calculations' in the District Engineer's Office.

* Mr. Claridge has been under my orders only from the 1st September last, but I had opportunities of knowing him for about a year; I consider him zealous and careful in the discharge of his duties-and recent events have shown that he is honest and trustworthy in his measurements and strict in his dealings with Contractors.

Directly admitting that he was responsible for the work done by the Contractor.

x a false quotation

PARA 4. The amount of Rupees 3902, for work done on the Road from Bellary to Raidrug has been arrived at, after careful calculation formed on measurements taken by Overseer Dennehy and accepted by the contractor.

2. With reference to the passage in the margin from the Officiating District Engineer's letter, your Memorialist begs leave to remark, that it is most extraordinary, and entirely opposed to the practice of the Department, that the measurements of an inexperienced Local Fund Overseer, (admitted to be "very inexperienced at the time," in para 6), a man who was unable to pass the prescribed examination, after having been 3 years in the Department, and who has since been dismissed for incapacity, should have been preferred to your Memorialist's, and especially so, when your Memorialist's measurements had been tested and verified by an officer, (Assistant Engineer Mr. Montserrat) specially selected by Superintending Engineer, Colonel Bean, and the accuracy of these very measurements is noted as a proof of your Memorialist's care in the performance of his duties in the District Service Register by the Executive Engineer Mr. W. Fraser (vide margin). This preference is the more unaccountable since the Overseer was himself doubtful of their accuracy, as appears from his remarks in his report forwarding the measurements. This report was sent to the District Engineer's Office with docket from your Memorialist, No. 180 dated 11th March 1873. In this Report, Mr. O'Leary states that he doubts the correctness of the measurements, as several items were given him by the Contractor. Besides this, the rule in the District is, that measurements made by the Overseer must be sent to the Range Officer for verification, and not be given to the Contractor. Of what avail is the 'careful calculation' mentioned by the District Engineer, if the measurements themselves were not reliable? The grounds advanced by the District Engineer for this preference namely, that "these measurements (Mr. Montserrat's) were taken long after the work was done," are not tenable. It has been shown above, that the work performed by the Contractor was measured in February 1872. Measurement was again made by your Memorialist in July 1872, that is, of work done during March, April, May and June, most of it being of work done in excess of the allotment, and which, strictly speaking, the Contractor had no right to have had measured at all, at least at that time. Mr. Montserrat's measurement was not made till November 1872, but ample allowance for settlement was made by that Officer, considering that the road was not used, being closed to traffic. The actual difference between Mr. Montserrat's measurements and those of your Memorialist amounted to Rupees 24-10-7; but there was some disputed work on the 28th to 34th miles about clearing &c. done departmentally by coolies, which the Contractor claimed as having been done by his coolies and which Mr. Montserrat set down at Rupees 352-0-0. On this item Captain Edgcome remarks "it is just possible that Mr. Montserrat's valuation may be very much under the mark". On this your Memorialist needs make no observation, except that Government on this point have acknowledged Mr. Montserrat's valuation.

3. With reference to the extract from Captain Edgcome's letter, (vide margin) it is remarkable that the 'amount is arrived at by careful calculation' founded on Mr. Dennehy's ('very inexperienced at the time') measurements which were made in February 1873, or six months after your Memorialist's measurements, (July 1872, amounting to Rupees 1156-10-7). Is it not very strange that the same reasoning did not apply here as had so much force in depreciating the value of Mr. Montserrat's measurements, namely, that 'they were taken so long after the work was done.' But it would appear from the whole tone of Captain Edgcome's letter, that those measurements which were taken in favour of the Contractor bore, from that very circumstance, a *prima facie* appearance of truth sufficient to justify their acceptance in preference to those

made by any other individual, whether Range Officer or Assistant Engineer! The whole phraseology of Captain Edgcome's letter reveals this unfortunate and unaccountable predilection on his part. For instance (Para 2) "The Contractor distinctly declines to accept payments on these measurements." The Contractor states this, the Contractor is prepared to accept that, the Contractor declines to acknowledge the other. The Contractor is every thing. Mr. Claridge is nowhere. What has Mr. Claridge to say on the matter? What explanation has he to offer? Surely these questions should have had a place in an enquiry affecting so seriously your Memorialist's official character and prospects. What guarantee, your Memorialist would respectfully ask, can any Government official have that his acts will meet with a candid and impartial judgment if the most serious charges are to be decided in this *ex parte* fashion? Your Memorialist having inspected and measured the Contractor's work, found that it differed materially from the measurements given by the Overseer who was in the words of the District Engineer "very inexperienced at the time." What was your Memorialist's duty in such a case? Was he, in the interests of Government to pass the Contractor's Bills? Certainly not. He brought it personally to the notice of the Superintending Engineer Captain Vertue, who sent for Sheikh Ebrahim and asked him about the measurements, and he refused to accept those made by your Memorialist. Thereupon Captain Vertue directed Mr. Fraser to measure the work. If that Officer had done so and verified your Memorialist's measurements, and the Contractor still objected, what would have been done. Would the Overseer's measurements have been adopted? Mr. Fraser not having checked the measurements by personal inspection a 1st Grade Assistant Engineer Mr. Montserrat was deputed by Colonel Bean to do the work, and the accuracy of your Memorialist's measurements was fully established. Mr. Montserrat's report was sent in December 1872. Is your Memorialist to be held responsible for the delay that has occurred in settling this claim?

Mr. Edgcome has been admitted to be responsible for the work done by the Contractor.

4. In reference to works of this nature, namely the construction of new sanctioned Roads, any one who has any knowledge of the mode in which contractors do their work must be aware that having made large advances to Sub-contractors they would much rather push on their works at the end of the year, than stop them, to wait till an allotment had been made, and so run the risk of losing a large portion of their money, and this especially so in the case of *ladlers*, (the persons chiefly employed in this instance) whose practice it is to travel all over the country in search of work and who never stay in one place any longer than they can help. What wonder then if Sheikh Ebrahim should push on his work, as he did in this case, beyond the allotment? It was clearly far better for him to lose the interest on the money advanced, than to lose the money itself, in as much as the whole work having been sanctioned, an allotment might reasonably be expected for the ensuing year.

5. But your Memorialist refrains from any further observations on the manner he has been dealt with in the matter of Sheikh Ebrahim's claims, and hastens on to lay before your Lordship his representations with reference to the claim of Contractor Allisat.

6. In Para 1 of the Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 417 of 1st November 1873, to the District Engineer it is stated as follows:—

"1 Under date the 9th August 1871 Mr. Supervisor Claridge instructed "Allisat to provide the following materials viz;—

" 57 C. yards Red gravel @ Rupee 1.	57 0 0
" 57 " Do. do. @ Annas 9.	32 1 0
	89 1 0

4

"On 305 yards of the 12th mile of the Maha Road,	256	2	0
"327 C. yards red gravel @ Annas 14.	143	1	0
"327 C. yards do. white @ "	429	3	0

The remark that the above was ordered by your Memorialist is not correct. It was ordered by Mr. Pearson the Taluk Overseer as will be seen on reference to the Order Book in possession of Ali Sait.

The total of the above 4 items is Rupees 518-1-0, which is included in the Bill already paid to Ali Sait, (Vide appendix A) for Rupees 876-6-0. The Overseer prepared bills with rates for gravel of Annas 12-6 for the 12th mile, and anns. 10-6 for the 11th mile, these rates being the averages of those given in the Contractor's Order Book. The Contractor refused to sign this Bill, but sent another with quantities not borne out by measurements. This your Memorialist refused to pass. On inspecting the road afterwards with the Overseer and Contractor, your Memorialist decided that annas 5-6 should be added to the rate for gravel on the 12th mile and Annas 4-6 for that on the 11th mile to compensate for materials not used. This was agreed to by the Contractor, and a bill was made out (Appendix A) for Rupees 876-6-0 which the Contractor signed, and the amount was paid to him on the 23rd February 1872, vide his acknowledgement on the Bill. The amount therefore received by the Contractor was Rupees 358-2-0 in excess of the above mentioned amount of Rupees 518-1-0 and very nearly equal to the amount of Rupees 360 claimed for wasted gravel as stated in the District Engineer's letter to the Chief Engineer No. 1803 of 11th November 1873, Vide appendix B, where it is described "as round number arrived at by the Contractor, without any measurements to support it—considering that one so interested would be inclined greatly to exaggerate the amount of compensation due to him for materials lost, I offered him Rupees 200, as a final liquidation in settlement of the amount claimed by him in his petition, and he has signed an agreement to accept this."

Your Memorialist must be pardoned for saying that this is the most extraordinary method of settling claims that has ever been resorted to in the Department of Public Works, and one that is likely to bring forward a number of other equally imaginary claims from Contractors in the hope of being equally successful with Ali Sait in working upon the pity and compassion of the District Engineer.

7. With reference to the 300 Rupees referred to in para 3 of Chief Engineer's Memorandum No 417, and said to be due for work done on the 2nd mile, your Memorialist needs only to state that Rupees 375-12-0 was paid for this work on the 28th August 1872 vide receipted Bill, appendix C. The Contractor Ali Sait is so ignorant of accounts that he did not even know what had been due to him for work performed on the 2nd mile, nor even that it had already been paid. There is however some excuse for him as he was very ill about that time and his agent who kept all his accounts had absconded.

8. In para 6 of the Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 417, reference is made to "passed Bills of Rupees 26-9-7 and Rupees 25-0-0, the former of which is for work done on 20th July 1871, for which part payment was made on 6th of August. Mr. Claridge will accordingly be called upon to show cause why they should not be paid, and why they were not paid in 1871-72 or subsequently, and if it appears that they should now be paid, it shall be done by stopping the amount from the Supervisor's pay abstract for November &c."

5

On this your Memorialist begs to state that the following payments have been made for work done on the 4th mile.

	Rupees	256	14	0
Bill 1st June 1871.	25	11	1	
Do. 6th August 1871.	95	10	0	
Do. 28th June 1872.				

The Bills for balance of Rupees 26-10-0 and Rupees 25, for material used on the Road, have been paid on the 28th June 1872 after measuring up all his work done on the 4th mile. The Contractor claimed Rupees 26-9-7 as balance due on his bill dated 18th December 1871, (after which date no work was performed on that mile) and received on the 28th June 1872 more than his claim, namely Rupees 95-10-0 (vide appendix D) which was the value of the whole of the work remaining to be paid for on the 4th mile. If your Memorialist had been disposed to act unfairly towards Ali Sait he had simply to pay what he claimed, namely Rupees 51-9-7 the amount of the bills Rs. 26-9-7 and Rupees 25.

9. Your Memorialist would beg especially to bring to your Lordship's notice that though in the paragraph quoted above the District Engineer was distinctly directed to call upon your Memorialist to explain why these bills had remained unpaid, nothing of the kind was done, as will be seen on reference to the District Engineer's reply (appendix B) to Chief Engineer's Memorandum No. 417, or surely that fact would have been mentioned therein and the futility of your Memorialist's explanation demonstrated. Had your Memorialist been called up by the District Engineer and confronted with both these Contractors, his explanation listened to, and the accounts and bills carefully examined, your Memorialist is certain that the matter would have been cleared up in 2 or 3 hours, and the Government been saved from punishing and degrading an Officer who has served 12 years as a Range Officer and when only an Assistant Overseer was 2 years in Executive Charge of Captain Babington's Division when that Officer was the District Engineer of Bellary. The 2nd Petition of Ali Sait was indeed sent to your Memorialist on the 3rd March 1873 but as it merely called for a decision on his former petition and contained no details of claims, your Memorialist was unable to show the futility of his claims, and was obliged to reply in general terms that they existed only in the Contractor's imagination &c. &c.

10. With reference to the remark in the margin, it must be remembered that the work was the maintenance of a road, and those portions falling into disrepair from time to time had to be taken in hand and proceeded with as necessity required. No cancelling of contracts (there was only one contract) took place, and as shown above in para 6, Ali Sait received full payment for every particle of work done by him.

11. Your Memorialist regrets that he has been obliged to take up so much of your Lordship's time by this lengthy explanation, but he could not in justice to himself avoid going at some length into the various matters that have been advanced against him. The District Engineer has, it is clear, unfortunately conceived a prejudice against your Memorialist, and views every thing that he has done in the most unfavourable light. Independently of the deduction of Rupees 40 a month to pay Ali Sait compensation for a claim that never had any ground to rest upon, your Memorialist has received only 30 Rupees a month as horse allowance, instead of Travelling allowance of 60 Rupees or thereabout

Handwritten note: If so, when were the bills of Rs. 26-9-7 and Rs. 25 for material used on the 4th mile paid? The Contractor claimed Rupees 26-9-7 as balance due on his bill dated 18th December 1871, and received on the 28th June 1872 more than his claim, namely Rupees 95-10-0 (vide appendix D) which was the value of the whole of the work remaining to be paid for on the 4th mile.

Total Rupees 183 years.

Footnote: Para 5th Chief Engineer, taking into consideration "Mr. Claridge's character as a very indifferent Range Officer, the manner in which he gave and cancelled contracts, and the fact that he was a very ill man."

Handwritten note: Your Memorialist is sorry to see that the District Engineer has been kept in the dark as to what was transpiring, and denied all opportunity of defending himself, that the District Engineer was endeavouring to obtain an order of Government discharging your Memorialist's case and so to shut him out from all hopes of getting redress. This may

See Remark No 2 - This sum is claimed for work done on 27th September -

he saw from the following circumstances:-

1st Your Memorialist was never called upon to give an explanation.

2nd When he applied for a copy of Chief Engineer's Memo No. 1137 of 3rd Nov 1873 and 5th Feb 1874 it was not supplied to him, nor did he see it till he got the proceedings of Government on or about the 7th March 1874 after the order had been passed.

3rd When copy of G.O. No. 194 A of 27th Jan 1874 was sent to him on the 18th Feb 1874, the concluding sentence "Separate orders will shortly be passed regarding" "ing Mr. Supervisor's claims" was carefully omitted.

This is intolerable.

Bellary.
28th March
1874

for the last 3 months. This has been done in advance by an order of the District Engineer to the Range Officer and not on the passing of the Bill. So the deduction actually amounts to a monthly fine of Rupees 30, or thereabout in direct but well devised covert contravention of the distinct order of Government No. 1137 dated 12th June 1877 forbidding fines exceeding Rupees 10. This fine was inflicted because your Memorialist failed to enter the number of miles travelled on a Sunday on his own private affairs within his Range, which the Range Officer passed the bills only for 30 Rupees horse allowance and on his declining to receive this amount, the above order was passed.

12. Your Memorialist humbly trusts that your Lordship will take the above representations into careful consideration and cancel the order for your Memorialist's reduction to 2nd Grade Overseer before he is relieved, and the order carried into effect; and thus save him from unmerited pain and degradation. There are several other instances of oppressive treatment which your Memorialist has suffered at the hands of the present District Engineer which he is prepared, if necessary, to bring forward and prove by Official letters &c.

With reference specially to the increase in the two items, Rupees 8,621 and Rupees 8902, and to the whole of this matter generally, your Memorialist would beg permission to remark that it is necessary in the interests of Government that an experienced and independent Officer should be deputed to sit the whole in the presence of your Memorialist, who will then be able to substantiate his statements by indisputable documentary evidence, and he is fully prepared to stand or fall by the result of the enquiry.

13. Your Memorialist has sent a copy of this Memorial to the District Engineer requesting him to forward it to Government through the Chief Engineer, but as in December last when your Memorialist begged to be informed of the ground on which the deduction of 40 Rupees monthly was to be commuted from that month's salary, he was informed that "the District Engineer will not take any notice of explanations that Mr. Claridge may wish to submit in connection with this decision," your Memorialist is obliged to forward his Memorial direct, lest it should fail to reach its destination through the peculiar notions of fairness to a person who has to defend himself which seem to be entertained by the District Engineer.

Your Lordships
Most Obedient Humble Servant
Samuel Claridge
Superintendent P.W.

Appendix A.

Bill for Petty Contract Work.

The Officer in charge of Railrug Range Bellary District.

To Alli Sait Contractor for work executed during

As per Estimate noted below.

Estimate.	Description of work.	No. in Progress Report.	Quantity. C. yds.	Rate.	Amount.	Remarks.
Annual Grant Trunk No. XIX	12th Mile:- Cutting side trenches and Road surface.		624	" 4 "	15 9 0	
	Gravel brought from a distance of 3 miles and laid in trenches and Road surface to proper section.		163 c. yds.	1 2 "	183 6 0	
	Spreading sand watering & tamping.	11	320 R. yds.	" 4 "	80 0 0	
	11th Mile:- Cutting side trenches and Road surface		149 1/2 c. yds.	" 4 "	37 7 0	
	Gravel brought from a distance of 2 1/2 miles and laid in trenches and on road surface		392 c. yds.	" 15 "	367 8 0	
	Spreading sand watering & Rolling.		770 Rg. yds.	" 4 "	192 8 0	
					Total Rupees...	876 6 0

(Signed) Alli Sait
Contractor.

Bellary
21st February 1872.

Memorandum from Taluq Overseer.

	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Remarks.
Cutting side trenches and Road surface.	312 c. yds.	" 4 "	53 "	
Gravel.	163 "	1 2 "	183 6 "	
Gravel.	392 "	15 "	367 8 "	
Tamping.	1090 Rg. yds.	" 4 "	272 8 "	
				Total Rupees... 876 6 "

Certified that the above claim is correct, that the measurements have been made by me, and that the work has been satisfactorily performed.

(Signed) S. Johnson Taluq Overseer.

Remarks by Range Officer.

After personal inspection and measurements I am satisfied that work to the extent indicated in this bill have been executed in a substantial manner.

(Signed) S. Claridge, Range Officer.

Received Rupees Eight hundred and Seventy six and annas six only.

23rd February 1872.

(Signed) Alli Sait
Contractor.

Appendix B.

Copy of a letter No. 1368 dated 11th November 1873 from the District Engineer Bellary to the Chief Engineer Public Work Department.

With reference to your Memorandum No. 417 dated the 3rd November 1873, I have the honor to report that on the 10th instant, I received from Mr. Fraser Contractor Alli Sait's original petition to Colonel Bean, together with the two bills amounting to Rupees 51-9-7. On the 11th idem I sent for the Contractor, and on questioning him, learnt that the additional sum of Rupees 360. claimed for material collected and said to have been wasted away, was a round number arrived at by the Contractor, without any measurements to support it; This sum added to the amount of two Bills, made his total claim Rupees 411-9-7.

Considering that one so interested would be inclined greatly to exaggerate the amount of compensation due to him for the value of materials lost, I offered him Rupees 200, as a final liquidation in settlement of the amount claimed by him in his petition, and he has signed an agreement to accept this.

If Government approve of this arrangement, I shall order this amount be paid to him and charged to the advance account, and shall recover the same from the salary of Supervisor Claridge, by five monthly instalments, he being responsible for the great irregularity that has taken place.

I very much regret the delay that has occurred in the settlement of this claim. Had the original papers received from Mr. Fraser been in my possession ten months ago, the claim would probably then have been settled.

(Signed) A. Edgemo Capt. R. E.
Offg. District Engineer.

(TRUE COPY.)

(Signed) W. Jackson
Sub Engineer. D. P. W.

8th December 1873.

Appendix C.

Bill for Petty Contract Work.

The Officer in charge of Raidrug Range Bellary District

To Alli Sait Contractor for work executed during the months of May and June 1872.

As per Estimates noted below.

Estimat.	Description of work.	No. in Progress Report.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Remarks.
Annual Maintenance Trunk Road No. XIX.	Turning up metalled Road surface to a depth of 1 inch and sectioning the same.		C. yds. 107 3/4	„ 4 „	26 14 8	
	Cutting a trench through a hard surface to form a toe for new materials.		C. yds. 25 1/4	„ 4 „	6 5 4	
	Gravel laid to section, average rate including carting.		C. yds. 342 1/4	„ 4 „	82 10 „	
	Watering and Rolling with a heavy roller with a coat of sand 1 inch thick including cartage of water from a distance of 1/2 mile.		S. yds. 4110	„ 1 „	256 14 „	
					Total Rupees...	375 12 „

(Signed) Alli Sait
Contractor.

Bellary
17th August 1872

Memorandum by Taluq Overseer.

	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Remarks.
Turning up metalled Road surface and sectioning.	107 3/4 c. yds.	„ 4 „	26 14 8	
Cutting a trench for forming a toe for new materials.	25 1/4 „	„ 4 „	6 5 4	
Gravel laid to section including cartage.	342 1/4 „	„ 4 „	85 10 „	
Watering and Rolling with a coat of sand 1 inch thick including cartage of water.	4110 sq. yds.	„ 1 „	256 14 „	
			375 12 „	

Certified that the above claim is correct, that the measurements have been made by me, and that the work has been satisfactorily performed.

(Signed) L. R. Mitchell
Ag. Bellary Taluq Overseer.

Remarks by Range Officer.

I certify that work has been executed to the extent shown above, measured 17th August 1872.

(Signed) S. Claridge
Range Officer.

Received Rupees Three hundred and Seventy five and annas twelve only.

(Signed) Alli Sait, Contractor.

2nd mile; or the measurement should be taken to the 1st mile.

Appendix D.

Bill for Petty Contract Work.

The Officer in charge of Raidrug Range Bellary District.

To Alli Sait Contractor for work executed during April 1872

Estimate.	Description of work.	No. in Progress Report.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Remarks.
	Supplying and spreading metalling 3 inches deep 4 yards wide covering the whole with one inch of gravel. Gravelling 1 yard in breadth 4 inches deep on each side of metalling watering and rolling the whole.					

Rg. yds. 85 1 2 ,, 95 10

Total Rupees... 95 10

(Signed) Alli Sait Contractor.

Herehall

28th June 1872.

Memorandum by Taluq Overseer.

Metalling and gravelling portions of 4th mile of Mocha Road.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Remarks.
	85 Rg. yds. 1 2 ,,		95 10	

Total Rupees... 95 10

Certified that the above claim is correct, that the measurements have been made by me, and that the work has been satisfactorily performed.

(Signed) S. Claridge Supervisor D. P. W.

Remarks by Range Officer.

I certify that work has been executed to the extent shown above and measured by me on the 25th June 1872.

Received Rupees Ninety-five and annas Ten only.

28th June 1872.

(Signed) S. Claridge, Supervisor D. P. W.

(Signed) Alli Sait Contractor.

27th January 1874,
represents that the
Engineer attending
by kept the petitioners
in dark till the deci-
sion of Court was passed
in his case as to
whether he was from
all hopes of getting a
redress; that indepen-
dently of the deduction
of Rs 40 a month to pay
Alli Sait compen-
sation for a claim that
never had any ground
to rest upon, he is
allowed only Rs 30 a
month as horse allow-
ance instead of travel
-ing
to Bellary 13/11/74

Government of Madras.

Public Works DEPARTMENT.

Petition No. 896 of 1872

From Mr. Samuel
Claridge,

Occupation. Supervisor
in the D. P. W.

Village.

Talook.

District. Bellary

Dated 28th March 1874

Received 30th

Enclosures 6

Abstract.

Offering explana-
-tions with reference
to G. O. No. 194 of
1872 dated
10/12/74-31-5-74

travelling allowance of
Rs 60 on thereabouts for
the last 3 months by
an order from the Dist
Engineer to the Range
Officer.
Prays that on a
careful consideration
of his representations
the Govt may cancel
the order for pet's reduction
to 2nd Grade Overseer
before he is relieved &
thus save him from
unmerited pain and
degradation.

Petitioner, being
informed that his
Petition must
be sent through
the Dist. Secy.
It cannot be
received direct
unless the D. S.
recommends it.

Copy of
15.4.74

Copy of ...
sent to D. S.
Copy of

980 ...
607 ...

P. W. D.

Proceedings of the Madras Government,
Under date the 18th

Read the following:-

From
The Dist Engineer, Bellary (H.C. No 225 of 21st May/74)

His Excellency the
Governor in Council
has again attentively
considered the case of
Mr Overseer Claridge
and sees no reason to
modify the decisions
before arrived at. It is ob-
served that Mr Claridge
claims to travelling

page 2 -

allowances are open to
Appeal to the Chief Engineer
through the District Engi-
neers of Bellary and Kur-
noor. Such claims
should be supported
by the necessary Inspec-
tion Lists and Bills.
But the insolent tone
of his communication
addressed direct to Govern-
ment merits the severest
notice; His Excellency
the Governor in Council
accordingly directs that
Mr. Clariope be suspended

That the
insolent tone
of his communication
addressed direct to Govern-
ment merits the severest
notice; His Excellency
the Governor in Council
accordingly directs that
Mr. Clariope be suspended

from all pay and al-
lowances for a period
of three months, and
that he be reduced
from the 2nd to the 3rd
class of Overseer.
His transfer from the
Bellary to the Kurnool
District has already
been ordered -

C.M.W.

Public Works Department
 Proceedings of the Madras Government
 Read the following
 From the Dy. Engineer
 Bellary (F.C. No 225 dated
 21 May/74)

His Excellency the
 Governor in Council
 has again attentively
 considered the case

of Mr. Overseer Flaridge
 as set before him
 in these appeal
 papers, and in the
 District Engineer's
 reply. And he de-
 liberately confirms
 the decisions before
 him arrived at.
 Mr.

Recd - 16.7.74 D.P. 8.74.
 Bb 13/7/74

A period of his
leisure & removal
to a distance with a well
merited funeral.

I advise the word "fall
 paper" & never use the
 Ch. Int. in connection
 with the Ls of Delivery & the
 Addressing claim - Refs
 & Treasury allow: that what
 may justly be due

I would much
like with the saying
which before me to
bring me to
the at the bottom
of the page

22

as complained of by
Captain Edgcomb as
he may deem desirable.

Chms.

The late District Sup
has. I think. some the
defence looked. It is
a pity that so in silent
a paper was received direct.
It is the act to remedy the
that I would surround our
C. for 3 months. As the
Sgt. is absent. Mr C's transfer
which will be long be in.
consent. is not recalled any. I
think he deserves punishment
at the hands of J.P. (not the
Ch: Sgt.) as his punishment
was addressed to
him. J.P.
3/7

Public Works Department

Letter from District Engineer, Kurnool,
No 46, dated 31st July 1874.

For orders.

Letter from District
Engineer of Kurnool
reporting that Mr.
Orriver Glasdale
had arrived and taken
charge on the 8th July,
submitted for orders
on the draft sus-

- pending him from
pay and allowances
for 3 months, with
reference to the Honora-
ble Mr. Lewis sugges-
tion to that effect.

It was obviously
the

Report that the order could
be carried out - but as the
Ch. Eng. report that it cannot
be done with out detriment to the
Pub. Service and accept
the alternative - Mr. Lewis
to have made the reduction
permanent - but the time
of that in past.

25/8

Wol.

Wol.

Wol.

Recd 16.7.74
10.10.74
Bis 20/6/74

the intention of all the
Members of Government
that Mr Claridge should
be severely punished
with as little incon-
venience to public
work as possible.
He had been transferred
by the Chief Engineer
at the late Captain
Edgemoor's request some
time ago, in exchange
for Mr Carroll whom
it was equally an object
to remove from Kurnool.
Now that he has actually
taken up his new
charge it would be
inconvenient to the
Public Service to
suspend him from
office.

office. Suspension
for 3 months would
have amounted to a
fine of Rs 80 x 3 = Rs 240.
And it is therefore res-
pectfully suggested
that equal amount
of punishment would
result from his
degradation to the
rank of Querees
3rd grade for 12 months.
 $(Rs 80 - Rs 60) \times 12 =$
 $Rs 20 \times 12 = 240.$

Commander Col. R.E.
Secy. Government
P.H.S.

P. W. Dept.

Proceedings of the Madras Government
Read the following

From
The Mr. J. Bellary (H.C. No. 225 of 21st May 1894)

His Excellency
the Governor in Council
has again attentively
considered the case of
Mr. Berseer Claridge
and sees no reason to
modify the decision
before arrived at.

It is observed
that Mr. Claridge's
claims to travelling al-
lowance are open to

At 18/8/94
C. S. M. S.
C. S. M. S.

appeal to the Chief
Engineer through the
District Engineer of
Bellary and Kurnool.
Such claims should
be supported by the ne-
cessary Inspection Lists
and Bills.

But the insolent
and unjustifiable
charges brought against
the District Engineer
in the memorial ad-
dressed by Mr. Claridge,
in spite of a well-known
regulation, direct to
Government, merit the
severest notice; and His
Excellency the Governor

in Council accordingly
directs that Mr. Claridge
be reduced from the 2nd
to the 3rd grade for a
period of 12 months.

His transfer
from the Bellary to
the Kurnool District
has already been
ordered —

C. M. W.

36
Supd Engineer Bellary ✓
DE Kurnool ✓
C. M. W. ✓
of Copies despatched 11/7/74.

Loi. 8/8/74.

Gen 25/6/74

Com. of H.S. & S. H. Adams.

PUBLIC WORKS.

The Sup: Ingr
Nellary

Date

Recd.

Recd. J.

6. 9. 71 Ingr. N. S. 71/61

Nos. 733. 734.

Mr. Brewer, Plaintiff

Intimating that the
Court see no reason to
modify the decision
before arrived at in his
case, and reducing him
from the 2nd to the 3^d
grade for a period
of 12 months —

No 733-734.