

(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. 2026	(W)	Press Mis.
Dated	8-12-	18 77.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

8th December 1877, No. 2,026 W.

General.
Establishment.

Read the following paper :—

No. 94. From Major J. BEATTY, R.E., Officiating Superintending Engineer, Godavery District, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Camp at Dowlaisheram, 1st December 1877, No. 2,823.

WITH reference to G.O., No. 1,226, of 10th April 1877, I have the honor to forward herewith copy of the judgment of the Subordinate Judge of Cocanada in the suit preferred against Mr. Larminie by P. Malliah; also two letters* from the Acting Supervisor in charge of the Range, and to request permission to appeal to the Civil Court.

- 1 Copy of Judgment.
- 1 Subbiah Naidu's letter No. 160 of 22nd October 1877.
- 1 Do. No. 184 of 28th November 1877.

*No. 160 of 22nd October and No. 184 of 28th November 1877.

2. As the time within which notice of appeal can be given is very short, I beg that you will be so good as to give me a reply by telegram as early as you conveniently can.

3. I shall also be obliged by your obtaining sanction for the payment of the Pleader's bill Rupees 155-7-9.

No. 95. ORDER THEREON, 8th December 1877, No. 2,026 W.

ORDERED that the following telegram be sent to the Superintending Engineer, Godavery :—

“Proposed appeal, Malliah *versus* Larminie, authorised.”

2. The payment of the Pleader's bill for Rupees 155-7-9 is sanctioned.

(True Extract.)

Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Government, P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, Godavery.
„ Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Exd. E. C. Shunker.
Spare Copies

015

Rajahmundry, on Office
Samalcottah 22nd October 1877

No 160

From

The As. Supervisor in Ch.

Rajahmundry on.

To

The offg. Supt. Engineer,
Godavery.

Sir,

In continuation of this
Office No. 84 dated 20th July last,
I beg. respectfully to report that
the suit brought by Palisetty
Mulliah against Government
regarding the Vakalapody Light
House has come to a close. The Judge-
ment in the case is to the effect that
Mr. Larmine personally is the party
by whom P. Mulliah has been
aggrieved in as much as he went
Home without tendering his statement
and

Rajahmundry Division Office.
Camp at Samulotah 28 November 1877.

No 184

From

The Acting Supervisor in ch.
Rajahmundry Div.

To

The Offg. Supy. Engineer
Godavery.

Sir:

As directed in your memo
No 2381 dated 24th ultimo, I respectfully
beg to submit herewith the copy of Judge-
ment just received from the pleader re-
garding the case brought by P. Mullish
against Mr. Sarminis about the Vakalapuri
Light House.

It would appear from the judgement
that the Subjudge bases the judgement
on two points principally, namely that Mr.
Sarminis had not tendered his written
statement prior to his leaving India for
Europe and that he (the Subjudge) does not
recognize the form No II Example II as
final payment receipt, such form not exist-
ing either in the Revenue or Judicial Department.

No 2381
Rajahmundry
Selected to the 11/11

2616

From

The Off. Supervisor
with Rajahmundry

To The Offg. Supy. Eng.

Dated 22nd Dec 1877

Re: Vakalapuri Light

House - Civil Rights

by P. Mullish &
regarding the
reporting for same
Department Service
in the

Enclosure in a letter
No 2023 dated 12 December
from the Offg. Supy. Eng.
Godavery.

[Handwritten signature]

Whereas it is a known fact that Mr. Larmine did tender such statement which I filed in the Court and also that the final payment receipt - according to the Departmental rules is valid. On the whole the Judgment seems to be partial, the Subjudge - having touched very little upon the evidence given by the witnesses on behalf of Government.

I beg also to submit herewith the Pleader's note for your information and to suggest that as the time for appeal will only be 13 days from the date of issue of the copy of decree, Orders of Government for Appeal may be obtained by wire if deemed necessary.

I beg to remain

Sir,

Yours most obedt servant

D. Dooling

Ag. Supervisor in k of

Rajahmundry

23/11/77.

Present.

Original sent Aug 4 of 1877.

By ~~Attorney~~

and by Tathil &
Fey-Kay & a -

Dear

Paige Officer Samalotta

in charge of ... D. ...

Judgment.

This was a suit for the recovery

Full copy

507

Dejansmady & Co.

Soberness.

Received &c } November 1877

July 1844

Enclosure in a letter
of 20 23 dated 28 December
from the Off. Sup. Eng.
Godavery.

Wakalatpadya deigh
Kharac - Submitting
Copy of deogh on end
given in the case -
regarding the -

of Rs 2,555- -- " due from the 1st Defendant
on account of Labour and Materials supplied
to him by the Plaintiff together with
interest and costs.

2. It is further set forth in the plaint
that one V. Venkataratnam entered into
a contract with the 1st Defendant in
January 1876 to supply materials and
labour for constructing a light house
at Vakkalapudi; that on 17th June
1876 the said contract was transferred
by the 1st Defendant to the Plaintiff;
that the Plaintiff delivered materials
worth Rs 2,27-8-0 at the site of the
above Light house, and also kept
ready at Cocanada and Samalotta
materials to the value of Rs 472-8-0
for delivery at the said site; that on
2nd September 1876, the Defendant person-
ally intimated to the Plaintiff by a notice

that he ^{should} ~~should~~ put a stop to supplying any more materials; and when enquired as to the reason thereof, the Defendant told him that there had been delay on his (Plaintiff's) part in the delivery of the materials which the Plaintiff denied; that Papers 2,555-4-4 including profits were due to the Plaintiff up to the time of his receiving the above notice after giving credit for Papers 599-8-4 received by him, and that the Defendant though demanded for this sum failed to pay the same to the Plaintiff; hence the suit.

3. The 1st Defendant Mr Carmine went home on furlough after he was duly served with summons.

4. The 2nd Defendant at his own request having been admitted in room of the 1st, contends that the contract above referred to was at first given to me

Vennum Venkataratnam on 22nd January
1876^(D.P.R.) that on his failure to adhere to the
terms of the said contract the same was
cancelled by the 1st Defendant; that then
at the request of the Plaintiff himself,
he was authorized to undertake the
supply of materials as per Plaintiff's
exhibit B dated 17th June 1876; that the
Plaintiff having violated the conditions
thereof the work was taken out of his
hands on 1st September 1876; that the
balance of Rs 321-0-0 due to him up
to that date was paid to him in full
as per Defendants' exhibit No I; that
the Defendant is only bound to pay
the estimated rates to the Plaintiff
for the work done and materials
delivered at the site of the Light house
but has nothing whatever to do with
the Plaintiff's actual expenses and

Error one

101 P. R.

as sh

that

191
that therefore ^{there} is nothing due to the Plaintiff
by the Defendants.

5. The following exhibits are filed on
behalf of the Plaintiff.

A Letter to the 1st Defendant by V.
Venkataratnam dated 20th May 1876.

B. Contract entered into by the 1st
Def^t with the Plaintiff dated 7th June 1876

C. Account book showing the number
of boats, which carried materials to
Vakalapudy.

D. Account book showing the receipts
and disbursements of the Plaintiff
at Samalcotha.

E - D^r - D^r at Cocanada

F - D^r - D^r at Vakalapudy

G Copies of several letters written by
the overseer.

6. The following exhibits are filed on
behalf of the Defendant.

Excess none

[Sd] P. P.

Fine C

- I Final payment receipt for Rs 321-8-11
by Plaintiff to the 1st Defendant
dated 2nd September 1876
- II Copy of Petty Contract account.
- III Rough Bill prepared by the 1st
Defendant.
- IV Data for sinking wells dated 18th
September 1875.
- V Abstract of estimates dated 18th
September 1876.
- VI Copy in the copy book containing
conditions under which V. Venka-
-taratnam was allowed to con-
-struct Light House dated 22nd
January 1876.
- VII Report of the overseer dated
11th June 1876 recommending the
transfer of contract
- VIII Copy of the memo. written by

12
The 1st Defendant to V. Venka

karatnam dated 21st June 1876.

IX Copy of the argee addressed by
the Plaintiff to the 1st Defendant
dated 5th September 1876.

7 Witnesses examined on behalf
of the Plaintiff.

- 1 Voleti Hanumayya.
- 2 Kanduri Ramaraju.
- 3 Durna. Venkataswamy.
- 4 Avasala. Subbayya.
- 5 Konaparty Chendrayya.
- 6 Mamidala Subbarayudu.
- 7 Bonu Surigadu.
- 8 Bonu Chendrigadu.
- 9 Sakkatotla Yellayya.
- 10 Padem Swamigadu.
- 11 Tunnaru. Korigadu.
- 12 Mummidi Narayya.
13. Royyala Yerrappa.

Examine.

7th page.

(22) P. R.

14. Garikina Pandarulu
15. Chodipalli Gangaraju
16. Chokka Annamma

8. The following witnesses are examined on behalf of the defendant.

1. Madireddi Subbarao Naidu
2. Lascar Chelligadu
3. Kopparti Bhaskararamayya
4. Venum Venkataratnam
5. Boddapati Seta Patirao

9. The following issues are framed by the Court.

I Whether the articles mentioned in the Memorandum B were supplied by the Plaintiff for the Light House, if not, what is the amount of goods supplied by the Plaintiff and what is the amount of the work done

errors none

8th Page

/s/ P. R.
O. G. S. R.

II Whether the amount admitted
by the Plaintiff to have been paid
to him is sufficient re-
-muneration for the supply
he made and for the work
performed by him;

III Whether the Plaintiff is to be
bound by the receipt No I
and whether the amount of
work mentioned in Exhibit II
as performed by the Plaintiff
is correct.

10. The Plaintiff's 1st witness Volati Hanu-
-maya a resident of Komaragiri and
a gumasta of the Plaintiff employed
at the work of the Light House at
Vakalapudy deposes that he kept the
account book marked IB and all the
items inserted therein are correct;

Errors none

1841 P. R.

Off shir

9th Page

that

151
that 25 boat loads of rough and cut stone,
70 baidy loads of rough stone, 20 garce of
lime, 4 boat loads of sand, 17,000 bricks
as well as 4 or 5 boat loads of bricks -
which the witness did not count, were
delivered at the site of the Light House,
that he does not know the terms of the
contract, that the totals which he
made in the book **E** are correct;
that the items from 1st to 18th April
in 1st, 2nd, 3rd & 4th pages of the book are
not in his hand writing but in that of
Vanduri Ramarazu another gumasta
of the Plaintiff, and that G. Venkataswamy
is the Plaintiff's father in law.

11 He further deposes that one
boat load of stone amounted to
10 cubic yards on measurement and

10th Page

Errors none

/s/ T. R.

off. sh.

the

was used for wells the remainder being left
in a shed near the Light House; that he
did not pay any money for the price
of Chumam or sand; and that at last
his master examined his accounts.

12. The Plaintiff's 2^d witness another
gumasta of the Plaintiff, deposes that
he wrote the account books marked
D and **F** and speaks to their correctness
that he wrote the accounts in the book
F from the 10th to 18th April, that the
account **D** also contains items of the
personal expenditure of the Plaintiff; -
that he paid cooly for digging stone
at $\frac{1}{2}$ a rupee per yard; that the account
D does not contain the quantity of
stone sent to Takalapoody; that some
stone was sent to Takalapoody and
the rest remained at Samal cotta;
that he cannot tell the whole quantity.

Error & name.

/s/ P. K.

Off. sh.

18
of stone quarried at Samulcotha; that he gave an account of it to the Plaintiff; that he cannot tell the number of boats on which he sent stone to Vahalapooddy and that he does not recollect what kind of account he gave to the Plaintiff.

13 The 3rd Witness for Plaintiff deposes that he used to enquire of the work performed by the Samastahs of the Plaintiff at Samulcotha, Vahalapooddy, and Coorunadu; that he examines the accounts C.D. E and F, that the items and totals therein are correct; that he saw all the bricks delivered at the site of the Light House, that he purchased 9000 bricks at Vuppada at Rupees 4 per 1000 and

Rs - as - p
36 - - -

bundles that they were carried

13 1/2 Page.

Errors none

13 1/2 P.R.

59 Shx

On

13
on bandies to the Light House; that
each gumasta had Rupees 10-10-
batta per day besides his pay for
working at the Light House; that
he cannot give the amount of pay
fixed for each gumasta; that there
was some stone and Chimmam left
at Vakalapady after the Contract
of the Plaintiff had been cancelled;
that the Plaintiff erected seven
sheds near the Light House which
are being used by Government.

14 The 4th Witness for Plam-
tiff who was his gumasta at
Vakalapady says that when the
Contract of the Plaintiff was can-
celled there was some chimmam
and stone belonging to the Plam-
tiff left at the site of the Light House.

20
out of the Chumam that was brought
to the place, more than half was
used in account of the Light
House; that the materials that
were left were used by Govern-
ment together with 4 sheds, and
a mill constructed by the Plaintiff;
that the 1st Defendant gave
the Contract for the Construction
of the Light House to Plaintiff
for Rupees 5,600 - " - " as per
estimate; that up to the time of
the cancellation of the Plaintiff's
Contract 22 wells were sunk and filled
up with gravel; that the 1st De-
fendant measured the stone
and one cubic yard of Stone
will make 3 bandy loads; that
the Plaintiff sold 2 boat loads
of stone to the Master Attendant

and that by the time of the Cancellation of Venkataratnam's Contract, the foundation work of the Light-House was finished.

15 The 5th Witness for Plaintiff deposes that he carried 9,000 bricks to Vadalapudy for hire at the rate of Rupees 9-00 per hundred

16 The 6th Witness says that he and nine others conveyed 9,000 bricks to the Light-House site, for hire at Rupees 9-00 per hundred and that the price of bricks was Ru. 36-00 per thousand

17 The 7th and 8th Witnesses state that they and some others 8 in number, were employed by the Plaintiff for making bricks each at Rupees 9-00 per measure but the former says that they were so employed for one month

Errors none

19th P. 72

24 sh.

16th Page

and

and the latter (8th witness) says that
it was only for 20 days they were
so employed; that they cut the
firewood required for burning bricks
and that they received 44--

18 The 9th witness states that
he burnt 37,000 bricks for the Light
House, that 20 or 30 persons including
himself took them to the Canal
and the bricks were carried on boat
to Socanada at Rupees 1-9- " per
100 and that he was paid. 50--

19 The 10th and 11th witnesses
speak to their having contracted
along with two others to dig stone
at Samulotta for the Light House
some at Rupees 8-- " and some at
Rupees 5-- " per yard, the rate
for cut stone being Rs 2-6-- " per 100
that they dug 600 yards of stone
and received - 317--

and that the above rates sometimes vary
20. The 12th witness states that
he carried stone from the quarry
at Samuleotta to the Canal side
in handies at 5 annas per yard
and received from the Plaintiff
on that account.

200—

21. The 13th witness says that
he conveyed the stone in 65 handies
from Cocanada to Takalapoody
and received Rs. 49— at 12 annas
per day, and the Plaintiff still
owes him Rs. 10—

59—

and that he loaded each handy
with half a yard of stone both
rough and cut stone—

22. The 14th and 15th witnesses
say that they carried the materials
from Cocanada to Takalapoody
and received Rs. 46—10— from the
Plaintiff and that the balance

18th Page.

incurs none

1/2/

of

of Rupees 226-- have been recovered
by them from the Plaintiff by
decree of the Sub Court of Cochinada
on its small cause side. 272-10--

23. The 16th witness deposes
that he imparted 25 boat loads
of stone from the big boats to
the shore, that each boat
load amounted to 10 yards of
stone, that he received hire
at the rate of Rupees 4-- for
each boat, that the whole
of the materials were used for
the Right House, that there
were some materials left at
the site by the time the Plaintiff's
contract was cancelled. 100--

24. The 17th witness who is
the Plaintiff in the suit being
re-examined on oath by his attorney
Mr. D. D. Miller deposes that
he received an authority from
19th Page. Errors none. the

51

the 1st Defendant to erect the Right House; that a verbal contract was entered into between themselves as regards the supply to be made by him; that the very contract given to V. Venkataratnam was not transferred to him nor was any contract given to him for the building of the Right House; but that the 1st Defendant promised him (Plaintiff) to pay for the Materials that may be supplied by him; that he signed the receipt No. I but did not know its contents in English; that the contract was cancelled after the receipt was given; that he spent Rs. 100 for carrying chumam belonging to Government; that ~~the~~ 1st Defendant promised to pay Rs. 6000, if he

continued supplying materials until
the work of the Light House was
completed; that he paid hire for
carrying chunam, which is denied
by Defendants Pleader; that the
1st Defendant measured in quarries
70 or 80 yards of rough stone and
100 or 150 feet cut stone and that
he purchased palmyra trees for sheds; 100--
25. I think it is not safe to place
any reliance upon the account books
of the Plaintiff marked C, D, E and F.
Nor, the oral evidence given by the Plaintiffs
1st, 2^d, and 3^d witnesses to the correctness
of the accounts is not satisfactory.
They were never examined by the
Plaintiff in the course of business. Further,
the 2^d witness stated in his cross exami-
-nation that he paid half a Rupee per
one cubic yard of stone supplied to
the Light House and entered the same
2nd Page.

Errors none

14 / P. R.

in

21
in the account book D. But when the witness was asked by the Defendant's Pleader to show such an entry in the account, he took the book into his hands, read the items for some time in certain pages, and said at last that he could not find any such item in it. He added that the 3^d Witness, the Plaintiff's uncle, used to examine the account, but never signed it for his having so examined, and that he gave the account book to the Plff. Again the witness says in his re-examination that he does ^{not} recollect what account was given by him to the Plaintiff—

26. The evidence of witnesses 4 to 16 and a portion of the 3^d Witness's Statement are worthy of credit, they being persons who actually did work for the Light House—

27 According to the statements of the
3rd, 5th, and 6th witnesses the
value of 9,000 bricks together with
hire for conveying them to the site 86-10-^{Rs. As P.}
Cost of 37,000 raw bricks which were
made by the 7th & 8th witnesses and
some others as servants under
the Plaintiff's order 44-^u

For burning the same and
transmitting them to Vakalapudy 50-^u

For digging stone at Samulettu
as per statement of the 10th and 11th
witnesses 317-^u

For carrying the same to the
Canal side as stated by 12th witness 200-^u

For conveying the same from
the Cocanada Sea Custom to
Vakalapudy on 65 handies
as stated by 13th witness 59-^u

For carrying materials from

Brought Over- 756-10-
Cocanada to the Takalapoody
Light House agreeably to the
evidence of the 14th & 15th witnesses. 272-10-
"

For importing materials from
the big boats to the shore as
stated by 16th witness - - - 100-
"

Total Rs. 1129-4-
"

of which deduct Rupees 599-8-
being the amount received by the Plaintiff
from the 1st Defendant as admitted
by both parties; and then remains
a balance of Rupees 529-12- Plaintiff's
attorney produced an account for
Rs. 1460-5-11 as value of tools purchased
for the work and for cooly for digging
foundations &c. But there is no evidence
adduced in support of it. The Court
cannot therefore interfere with it.
Wherefore, the abovementioned sum
of Rupees 529-12- must be considered
as due by the 1st Defendant to Plaintiff

90
according to the reliable evidence on —
record.

28 The 1st Defendant with whom the plain-
tiff had entered into contract left
India for Europe without making any
answer to the Plaintiff's claim though
he was duly served with summons.

The 2nd Defendant representing himself
for the 1st Defendant produced among
other exhibits the receipt N^o 1 dated 2nd
September 1876 and pleads that this
being a final payment receipt, —
the Plaintiff can claim no more money
for remuneration. The 2nd Defendant
and his pleader construe this document
as one to bar the rights of any person —
who grants it for any further amount
of money on the ground that such receipts
are obtained in the Department Public
Works, when the balance is fully discharged.
Defendants 5th witness, the Head Accountant,

deposed in support of the receipt, and asserts that he explained the meaning thereof to the Plaintiff when he signed it. But the Plaintiff states that he does not know English in which language the receipt was written and that he signed the receipt believing it to be a mere acknowledgment of the receipt of the money of Rs 321—-. It is true that the Plaintiff does not understand the English language, nor do the two words — "final payment" which precede the word receipt make any one believe that the money paid under it was in discharge of the whole demand. For, no such term as final payment receipt is in use either in the Judicial or Revenue Department nor in any of the preliminary definitions of any act. The proper meaning that can be given to it is that it is a receipt

given for the money paid finally or lastly. Such receipts cannot therefore deprive the party of his right to any remuneration for the work actually done by him.

29. Further, the 1st Defendant or the Overseer under him (1st witness) neglected to measure the materials supplied by the Plaintiff when they were received at the Light House as it can be seen from the deposition of the 1st witness. 1st Defendant merely measured some stone after the completion of 22 wells and suddenly disappointed the Plaintiff by issuing orders to withdraw the work from him even without giving him any previous notice. If the poor contractors are to be disappointed after they finish the hard portion

27. Page

33-

of the work, such as quarrying and conveying stones and supplying bricks, sand ~~sea~~, how can these poor people satisfy the labourers who have actually performed work under them.

30. Plaintiff's attorney Mr. Miller says that the Plaintiff does not claim any money from Government but from the 1st Defendant Mr. Sarminie who deceived him (Plaintiff).

31. If Mr. Sarminie relied very much on the receipt exhibit I ~~same~~ as the 2nd Defendant, he would have at once filed the receipt and defended the suit. He never did so.

32. Under these circumstances it

(True copy) *Heathly - Major. R. E.*
Offg. Supg. Engineer
Goodover

is adjudged that the 1st Defendant personally do pay Plaintiff Rs 529-12- together with proportionate costs.

2nd Defendant do bear his own costs.

(Signed) V. Gopal Rao
Subordinate Judge.
(True Copy)

Errors none

P. Gopaul Rao
A.E. H. Writer.
29th & last Page.

P. Ramarow
A.E. Sheristadar

Copy applied for 29th October
Additional papers 17th November
Called for }
Do- Supplied - 22nd November } 1877
Ready for delivery 23rd November

Compd I Chicka Rao.

Compd *(Signature)*

NO. 2823 Establishment.

FROM,

THE OFFG. SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

GODAVERY DISTRICT.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

MADRAS.

Encls. 3

CAMP DOWLAISHWERAM, 1st December 1877.

1 Copy of
Judgment
1 Subordinate Judge
letter No 160 of
22nd Oct 1877
1 Do No 184 of
28th Nov 1877 -

SIR,

With reference to G. O. No 1226 of
10th April 1877. I have the honor to for-
ward herewith copy of the Judgment of
the Subordinate Judge of Cocanada in
the suit preferred against Mr. Carmine
by P. Malliah, also two letters from the
Acting Supervisor in charge of the Range,
and to request permission to appeal
to the Civil Court -

2. As the time within which notice
of appeal can be given is very short.
I beg that you will be so good as to
give me a reply by telegram as early as
you conveniently can -

3. I shall also be obliged by your
obtaining

Enclosure in a letter No 2823
dated 28 December 1877 from
the Offg. Supg. Engineer G.O.

Copy of the Judgment
of the Subordinate Judge
of Cocanada in the suit
preferred against Mr.
Carmine by P. Malliah -

obtaining sanction for the payment
of the pleader's bill Rules 155-7-9

I have the honor to be
Sir

Yours Most Obedt Servant
L. Beatty Major R.E.
Off. Lt. Engineer G.O.D.

Establishment.

FROM,

THE OFFG. SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

GODAVERY DISTRICT.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MADRAS.

DATED 1st December 1877.
RECEIVED


No. 2823

ENCLOSURE 3✓

Suit - Forwarding copy
of Judgment in the -
preferred against M
Laminie by P. Malliah,
requesting sanction to ap-
pear against it, and to
pay the pleader's bill -

to 8. Dec. 1877

to 10. April 1877 No. 1226.



No. 2026 W

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 8th Decr 77 -

Read the following :-

From,

The Offg. Super Engineer } (H.C. No. 2823 of 1st Decr 77)
Godavery

Ordered that the
following telegram
be sent to the
Superintending Engineer,
Godavery: -

Proposed appeal Malliah
versus Laminie withdrawn.

2. The payment of the
pleader's bill for
Rs 155-7-9 is

Telegram despatched 8th Decr 77. sanctioned. W.H.
7.12.77

Super Engineer Godavery Sg
Cdr. S.H. Acker 5

W.H. H.P.

Depd. 14-12-77

Clerk
Sect. of (1877) ~~Public~~
PUBLIC WORKS.
To *The S. & G. Goddard*

Dated
Issued
Recd. Encl.

G. O. & Beer 1877, No. 2026

NCS. 94-95

Unit The S. & G. Goddard
authorized by telegraph to
appeal against the judgment
in the — preferred against
McDermine by P. Malish
The payment of the Pleader
will sanctioned for the
defence of the above —
sanctioned

Sanctioned