

- (1) Number of pages _____
(2) Date of repair _____
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Public Works

DEPARTMENT

<i>141</i> G.O. No.	<i>354</i>	Press
<i>141</i> B.P. No.		Mis.
Dated <i>8-2-</i>		<i>1876</i>

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
8th February 1876.*

No. 141. Read the following letter from Major J. BEATTY, R.E., District Engineer, Godavery, to Major-General G. W. WALKER, R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Dowlaishweram, 25th January 1876, No. 3,141:—

I HAVE the honor to request that sanction may be given to Assistant Engineer

1. No. 5 Range Officer's letter, No. 289, of 26th November 1875.
1. Do. No. 349, of 31st December 1875.
1. Do. No. 359, of 10th January 1876.
1. Copy of order to the Contractor, No. 614, of 29th September 1874.
1. Copy of complaint.

* Nos. 332, 333, and 480.

Mr. Larminie to defend three* suits brought against him by Contractor S. Venkatanarsiah under the following circumstances.

2. Venkatanarsiah having ceased to work for the department in No. 5 Range, as stated in my letter No. 2,827, of

17th ultimo, offered his services to No. 1 Range, and he undertook to carry out earthworks on the Takee main drain and the Coringa and Ingeram canals. In a memorandum dated 18th January 1875, copy of which is herewith sent, Mr. Larminie authorized him to commence work.

3. His duty in connection with the works was to supply labor and execute certain earthworks, for which he was to be paid by measurement at the estimate rates. He brought some labor and commenced work, but misunderstandings arose between him and his workmen, they deserted him, and his work came to a standstill about 23rd February 1875.

4. The Contractor has now brought three suits in the Courts of the Subordinate Judge and District Munsif of Cocanada for the recovery of advances he states that he made to certain buntadars or headmen of gangs of coolies. In each plaint he has named a buntadar as 1st defendant and Mr. Larminie as 2nd defendant.

5. So far as I can judge Mr. Larminie is not responsible for the recovery of these advances, and should be authorized to defend the suits.

No. 142. ORDER THEREON, 8th February 1876, No. 354.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 9.

AUTHORITY is granted for the defence of the suits in question at the public expense in the first instance. But the

attention of the District Engineer is called to the Rules in Chapter XIII. of the Public Works Code, under which a copy of the plaint and of the proposed draft answer should have been submitted.

(True Extract.)

Major-General, R.E.,
Secretary to Government.

To the District Engineer, Godavery.
„ Controller of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. S. T. Austin.
Spare Copies

614

News

20/1/17

Contractor S. V. Narasayya is authorized to proceed with the excavation of the Lake main drain. He will be paid at the Estimated rates for such portions as he completes to the full section & for the incomplete portions Rs 10 (Ten) per cent will be deducted as security from the payment until it is completed. He is also to complete the portions of the drain which were partly done last year and the payments then made will be deducted from the full corresponding accounts payable to the Contractor (Narasayya).

Narasayya is also authorized
to spend balance of allotments
remaining for 1894-95 on boring
and digging canals for repairing
widening and raising banks up to
the end of official year (March 1895)
and he will be paid at the estimated
rates. Work must be done on those
portions of the drain ordered by the
officer in charge of the work.

Pay accounts will be made at least
once in a month and if possible every 15 days.

Any timber or tree wood required
by the Contractor will be sold to him at
the rate of 4 (four) annas per cubit.

yard, cutting and piling to be
done by himself.

Dowlaiswaram E/spt/ J. F. Carmine
29th December 1894 Asst Engineer

(True Copy)

Camp Coimbatore
18th January 1895

W. R. R. R.
Superintendent in ch.
S. S. D. —

Drain

No 289

No 5 Range Office Godavari Dt
Samulcottah 26 Nov 1875

From

The Officer in charge No 5 Range God.

To

The Superintending Engineer
Godavery District.

Sir

I have the honor to bring to

notice that late contractor

S. V. Kirsiah has instituted

4 small cause suits Nos 331

No 331
Trunk
Road

instituted against me
and Supervisor Cotiah for
the recovery of Rs 217-14-0
being the amount of gravel
supplied to No 5 Range works
together with subsequent in-
terest and costs.

No 332

— against me and
one Buntadar for the recovery
of Rs 203-8-0 being the amount
of an advance for repairing
a canal in No 1 Range together
with do do.

Lake
Drain

332 and 333 in the Subordi-
nates Court and another No
408 in the District. Mooniff

No 333

— against me and one
Buntadar for the recovery
of Rs 57 being the amount
paid as an advance for
repairing do do in No 1 Range
with do do.

Lake
Drain

Court at Cocanada for the pur-
poses noted in the margin
and to request that you will

No 30

— against me and
another Buntadar for the
recovery of Rs 20 as per ad-
vance paid for repairing
do do in No 1 Range with
do do.

Lake
Drain

be good enough to permit me
to disburse from the funds at
my disposal all the expenses
requisite for their prosecution
and to debit the charge
against

M/256/76.

No. 8 - Feb 16 B N 14

against the "Miscellaneous advances"

I have the honor to be,
Sd/- J.C. Larmine
Assistant Engineer in charge
No. 1 Range G.D.
(True Copy)

J. Beatty Major R.
Dist. Engineer Godavery D.

11/25/96

No. 8 - Feb 16 B. 11/141

No 349

Asst Engineer's Off
Camp Cannetotta
31st December 1895

From

The Asst Engineer, who is
off No 5 on Rajahmundry
Range

To

The Ag. Superintending Engineer
Godavery District

Sir,

I have the honor to forward
herewith copy of plaint in suits Nos 332, 333
& 480 as detailed in my Nos 289 & 301 dated
26 November & 4 December respectively. The plaint
in each case only differs in the amounts claimed.
I do not understand why I have been made
2^d defendant, in these cases for, with reference
to paras 2 & 4 of the plaints, it will be seen
from a reference to the records of the Southern
Sole Division of No 1 Range, that no contract
was entered into with the Plaintiff, he simply
received a written order to go on with the work
of improving the Lake Drain, with the proviso
that it should be carried out to the satis-
faction of myself or any other authorized
inspecting officer, and that if this condition
were

were not fulfilled the work would be taken from him.

On this understanding the Plaintiff commenced the work, but after a very short time finding that all his workmen were leaving him and that there was every prospect of the work coming to a stand (in which case the allotment would not have been utilized) I took the work out of his hands & for the remainder of the season carried it out on the better Contract system.

Regarding the advances made by the Plaintiff no responsibility whatever was undertaken by me nor do I know anything about them (Advances). I have since ascertained however that the 1st Defendant acknowledges having received the specified amounts but refuse to refund them on the grounds that fully equal sums were owed to them by the Plaintiff for work done for him elsewhere. Under these circumstances I trust that Government will give permission to defend the suits which have been postponed for hearing until the 24th of January. As already explained in my 20th of 4th Inst. Rs 480 for the recovery of Rs 20 has been heard, but judgment has not been given. In this case

case the first Defendant acknowledges his liability, but pleads poverty as his reason for not having refunded the money advanced to him

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Yours most obedt servt

J. C. L. [Signature]
Asst Engineer, in ch. of
Rajshimur Range

Samulkotah 7

No. 359.

From

The Officer in Charge, Nessor
Rajahmundry Range Godavari

To
The Officer in Charge, Nessor
Range Godavari Dist.

Dated 9th } January 1876
Desp 10 }
Recd

Subject

Requests he will be so good as to forward
to the District Engineer, with as little
delay as possible, a copy of the order given
by the undersigned in last year to Contractor
S. V. Narsiah to go on with the work
of enlarging the Lakee main Drain. The
District Engineer has called for a copy of
this document, but it cannot be furnish-
ed by the undersigned, as it entered in
the Southern Sub Division Records of
your Range. Requests also that the Dist.
Engineer may be informed that Narsiah
received no written order to stop work, such
an

From

23/10

The Dist Engineer
in charge of the

Rajahmundry Range

To the Dy. Commr.

Engineer Godavari

Dist. Godavari Range

Samulkotah City of

Samulkotah City of

Samulkotah City of

Samulkotah City of

1/11/76
2/1/76

an order was not necessary, for the simple
reason that the work came to a stand
owing to Tursiak's men refusing to
work under him; when he (Tursiak)
was verbally informed that he might
take his departure. This circumstance
has been already reported to Major
Beatty, but he seems to be under
the impression that copy of an order
to stop work may be obtained from
Net Range.

(Sd) J. L. Larmine
Asst Engineer

(True copy)

Melborman Captain R.C.
Executive Engineer body

Godavery

Mr. 256/76

District Engineer's Office Godavery
No 3141 Dowlaishuram 25 January 1876

From

Major J. Beatty R.E.

District Engineer Godavery

Major General G. W. Walker R.E.

Secretary to Government S.W.D.

Madras

Sir,

I have the honor to request that
sanction may be given to Assistant Engineer
Mr. Larmine to defend three suits brought
against him by contractor S. Venkatanarsiah
under the following circumstances:-

2. Venkatanarsiah having ceased to work for
the Department in No 5 Range, as stated in
my letter No 2827 of 17th ultimo, offered his
services to No 1 Range and he undertook to
carry out earthworks on the Takee Main
drain and the Coringa and Ingeram
canals

Canals. In a Memo. dated 18th January 1875, copy of which is herewith sent, Mr. Larminie authorized him to commence work.

3. His duty in connection with the works was to supply labor and execute certain earth works for which he was to be paid by measurement at the estimate rates. He brought some labor and commenced work, but misunderstandings arose between him and his workmen, they deserted him, and his work came to a stand still about 23rd February 1875.

4. The Contractor has now brought three suits in the Courts of the Subordinate Judge and District Munsiff of Coimbatore for the recovery of advances he states that he made to certain huntadars or headmen of gangs of Coolies. In each plaint he has named huntadar as 1st defendant and Mr. Larminie as 2nd defendant.

So far as I can judge Mr Larminie is

is not responsible for the recovery of these advances and should be authorized to defend the suits.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your Most Obedient Servant
J. Peatty. Major & R.E.
District Engineer Godavery

Public Works Department.

UNDER date the 8 Feb/76

Read the following :

Здрав!

The District Engineer
Godavari

(N.E. Co. 3141 of 25 Jan'y/76.)

Authority is granted for the defence of the suits in question at the public expense in the first instance. But the attorney of the District Engineer is called to the rules in Chapter XIII of the Public Works Code under which a copy of the plaint and of the proposed draft answer should have been submitted.

Sh. St. Louis Coolanery
" Cant. R. R. Accts:

In 5

Drsp-8-2-76

May 2/2

Orsd-17-2-76

Edno 1986: Jan 1/26.

Drummond: 1896 July.

The District Conjurist

Godwin
No: 756

Secretary to Board
J. P. M. L.

Madras

Noted 25 January 2

Oct 25 - 20 - 1870

Dec. 31

No 3141 Jour.

Respecting direction to

defend certain ducts

brought against him

Dr. Wm. L. Garrison

by Contractor J. Venkata

partially.

171.141

5-1-76

PUBLIC ~~WORKS~~.

In

O. E. T. Lavery

Noted

Found

and

Each

 ϕ_1, ϕ_2

8 Feb

1876, No.

354

147-142

Suits - Sanction accorded
to defend certain suits brought
against her Apostrophe Law-
-firm by a contractor.