

(1) Number of pages 38

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Public Works

DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.

84 (W)

Press
Mis.

Dated

10

1

18

77

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
10th January 1877. No. 84.*

No. 158. Read the following letter from W. B. LEGGATT, Esq., A.I.C.E.,
Officiating District Engineer, Bellary, to Major-General G. W. WALKER,
R.E., Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Bellary,
3rd January 1877, No. 4,097:—

With reference to Proceedings of Government, No. 71, dated 14th September
last, sanctioning the retaining of the services of the Government Vakeel in the further
prosecution of Mr. Johnson, late acting Taluq Overseer in the Koodlighee Taluq of the
Hospett Range, I have the honor to report, which I do with much regret, that the
temporary Deputy Magistrate who tried
the cases as per margin against him on
the 10th October last has thrown them out,
and the man has been acquitted of even
the minor charge of attempt at cheating.

1. Kencoonta Tank case.
2. Oodachalama tank case.
3. Wudderhully do.
4. Toomargoody do.
5. Ramdroog do.
6. Goodicotta do.

2. Considerable delay has occurred
in furnishing this report owing, in the first place, from the delay I experienced in
obtaining copies of the judgments in the cases which I now forward for your informa-
tion, and, secondly, from the pressure of other duties during the last few weeks, which
I need not detail.

3. Amongst the Vakeels of the Bellary Court, I could not find one who would
undertake the prosecution, as they were all fully employed, and the Government Vakeel,
I regret to say, reported sick, and was unable to attend during the trial.

4. As the trials appear to me to have been conducted in an unsatisfactory manner,
and as the man has again been acquitted, I have the honor to request instructions as to
any further proceedings against him, for there are twelve more cases to be disposed of.

No. 159.

ORDER THEREON 10th January 1877, No. 84.

ESTABLISHMENT, No. 10.

RECORDED.

2. The Government are not of
opinion that further prosecution of the
case would be desirable.

(True Extract.)

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

To the District Engineer, Bellary.

„ Examiner of Public Works Accounts.
„ Judicial Department.

Ed. S. T. Austin.

Spare Copies

Register Case No. 4
1876

Judgment

In this case the 1st witness deposed that the accused when he was an Overseer of the Sighy Taluk, had sent in a bill for Rs 400, as being the amount expended in account of repairs done to the Tank in the town of Sighy, that in his examination in December 1875 he found work executed to the amount of Rs 371-9-3, that 1859 cubic yards of earth work was done at Rs 29-7-6 at 2-6 a yard, that the same work would cost Rs 29-7-9 at 3 pice a yard, that the new stone work of 80 yards was worth Rs 30 at 6 annas per cubic yard, that the repairs of 250 yards would cost Rs 5-3-4 at 4 pice a yard, that the removing of earth 460 yards would cost Rs 10-9-6 at 0-4-6 a yard, that the carriage of implements for 15 miles would cost Rs 6, that the sentenced

stones were valued at Rs 4-2,
that he did not include the item
Rs 5-7-3, specified in the bill,
marked (c), ~~as~~ as he did not
see the earth work stated in
this bill marked (a), he did not
take Rs 22 into account, that
he measured the works shown
by the prisoner, that the works
were completed in March/75,
that he did not charge anything
for the removal of the
water from the place where
breach took place, and that
the bill sent in by the accused,
did not contain any thing
charged on this account.
The 3rd witness states that he
was present at the time
where the 1st witness came
to measure the works, that
no measurement was made
of stone work; that the small
trees or bushes on the bund
were removed that Rs 25
would have been the probable
cost for their removal, that
the bund was filled up with

earth, and that, at the place
where the breach occurred,
was water to the depth of 10 feet.
The 3rd witness said that he
had small ~~live~~ live trees or bushes
and used on the bund he
moved by ~~contract~~ or directed
by the accused, that he got
the Calingulak lowered by
taking some stones from out
of it, that he filled up the small
holes on the bund, that he
caused the removal of the slag
near water from the place
where the breach occurred,
that the ~~work~~ work did the earth
work by contract, and that
the accused took from him
two receipts for payment
three rupees to the coolies.
The 4th witness states that
he did not write a report
the report made by the accused
in March/75 about the
performance of the repairs
of the Tank, saying that he
never saw the Tank.

and the work done at the time,
but he did not know whether
the accused did or did not
do the work for Rs 400, and
that that work was completed
in the month of March
of the same year -

The prisoner said that
he did give to the work the
value of Rs 400 for which
he sent in 8 bills, that he
never misappropriated
the public money, that
he did not know how
the 1st witness could say
the work fell short by
Rs 28-6-9 and that the
1st witness did not in-
clude in the account the
charges incurred for the
stone work done near the
baking place, for the re-
moval of the trees from
the ground, and for the
work of holes caused
thereon. From there,

it is seen that there is no
other evidence except that
of the 1st witness to show that
the work is deficient. And
only the accused but also
one or two witnesses state
that the 1st witness left some
of the work executed from
the account. It is very
doubtful to say that the
work is really less by Rs -
28-6-9. Both the measure-
ment & amount of the work
states in the bill agree
with the measurement
of the 1st witness, that in
consequence of the omis-
sion of the 1st witness to
include in the account
the amount of the bills
marked (c & f), it is
supposed that this was
the cause for the defi-
ciency of the work. There
is no reason to believe

that the works mentioned in
the ~~allegation~~ bills were not
performed, that as the ~~27th~~
witnesses ~~suppose~~ that those
works were ~~executed~~, it is
impossible to say that the
work was not done. It seems
that the difficulty to find
out the truth arose from
want of inspection on the part
of the ~~the~~ witness and from
the inspection of the
works a few months
after its completion.
Consequently there exists
no reason to suppose
that the accused misap-
propriated any money.

There not being
sufficient grounds either
to commit the accused
to the Court of Sessions
or to remand him, the
Court is ~~that~~ ~~since~~
he is discharged

under Section 195 of the Cri-
minal Procedure Code.

2-10-96. (Signed) K. M. S. S. S.

J. Dy. Magistrate
Bellary.

/True translation/

K. M. S. S. S.

J. Dy. Magistrate
Bellary

Register Case No. 5
1876 6

Judgment

In this case the 1st witness, charging the accused with having committed Criminal breach of trust by misappropriating the sum of Rs 84-4-10 alleged to have been spent by him in repairing the Tank bund at Ramnagar, when he was Overseer of Kudlighi Taluq,--

That the accused sent in the list of charges amounting to Rs 364-14-4, although the work was really done for Rs 280-9-6, that he came to know this deficiency in the work when he inspected and measured it in December 1875, that he calculated the stone work to be $76\frac{1}{2}$ cubic yards at 4 annas a yard, that for the earth and excavating works done he charged Rs 1-4 a cubic yard and Rs 1- for filling in earth, and 6 pice for tamping, that he measured the bund from the top to the crest of the sluice thinking it was opened, that gravelling work came to 123 cubic yards and it was charged at Rs 1-6 a cubic yard, that the work of

engaging in the ^{remittance} ~~security~~ stones came to $26\frac{3}{4}$ ^{squares} yards and
it was charged 4 pice a yard: that
no repairs were executed to Calingula.
Consequently he omitted to take into account
the work valued at Rs 2-13-4, and that
the accused spent Rs 339-11-10 out of the
balance left, though no separate funds
were entrusted to him.

The 2^d witness deposed that he did
not do any work.

The 3^d witness stated that he did the
stone, earth and gravel works of the Tank
bund and the side stone work of the
Calingula, that he received Rs 2.00, that
Rs 2.50 were still due for the work he did,
that he dug and tested the bund at a dis-
tance of 30 yards from the Calingula;
that a person named Venkatappa of
Chittledroog was engaged in the Calin-
gula to do the stone work; that Venka-
tappa, the 2^d witness did not do the
work; and that after he performed
the work the accused had the earth
work executed and tamped the earth
by Coolies.

7
The 4th witness deposed that the pit
which was at a distance of 2 chains
from the Calingula was filled up,
and that he could not say how much
of the work or when it was performed.

The 5th witness deposes that the
breach in the Tank bund occurred in
May 1875, and that upon the report
of the accused sanction was given
for getting it filled by him, that
Rs 200. were sent for the work, that
the breach was repaired when he
went and inspected it on 31st July,
that he saw the works shown by the
accused as being executed by him,
that he did not measure the work as
it was incomplete, that he did not
see or measure it afterwards and
that he found out any omissions then.
The accused pleads that the work was
correctly executed according to the
amount of the bills he sent in, and
that he did not misappropriate the
money in question and the 6th witness

did not measure all the works done. P. 137-4-11

From all this it appears that no one measured the work soon after it was completed except the 1st witness, who also seems to have examined it a few months after its execution.

It appears that some part of the work (valued Rs 137-4-0) was done by Coolies and the other part valued at Rs 189-10-6 by Contract.

The work done by Coolies cannot be equal to that performed by Contract. The rates of the accused differ from those of the 1st witness, hence there is a difference. Therefore it cannot be said that the accused has committed the offence charged.

There being no reason either to commit the accused to take his trial before the Court of Sessions or to remand him, the Magistrate directs that he be discharged under Section 198 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

and to be released on bail of Rs 1000
/ True Transcription / J. Dy. Magistrate

N. M. M. M.
J. Dy. Magistrate, Bellary.

Register bound 1st 1876.

Page 28

The accused is charged with the commission of a criminal breach of Trust when he, an Overseer of the Railway Station having misappropriated Rs 32 in executing the repairs on the Tank bund at has been accused. The by him for the amount alleged to have been expended, is proved.

The 1st witness states that, on his measurement of half the right side of the Tank bund in the month of December 1875, he found no work was executed, that he did not see the other half, that the accused was present but unable to show the works performed by him, and that the people said that no work of any kind was done during the year to the Tank bund.

The 2^d witness said that he presumed that some one might have cut and removed the shrubs

which he once saw on the Tank
himself he painted the end of
find there there afterwards.

The 3^d witness says that he
did not know whether any sort
of work was or was not done on
the Tank himself.

The 4th witness corroborates
statement of the 3^d witness.

The 5th witness said that he
saw the skulder on the hind
wheel of the holes there, as
directed by the accused, for
which the accused gave him
Rs. 32, on a receipt given by him.

From the facts reported by the
6th witness, it is evident, that,
as the Tank himself has asked, some
time was granted in it in
for Rs. 94 on account of its repair,
the then Overseer of the place
got the work done and sent in a bill
for Rs. 66-12-4, that after he took
charge of this Tank, the accused
sent in a bill for Rs. 32, that when
he went on the 26th September
1875, he found no work of any kind
was executed, and that he therefore
brought the fact to the notice of the
District Engineer by his report.

The accused says that,
according to the bill he sent in,
he got the skulder of the hind
wheel of the holes there
removed that he did not misappre-
hend the money in question.

Upon this, it appears
that the work executed by the accused
is not such as could be seen by
any who examine it a few months
after its execution. It would have
been better had the 1st & 6th wit-
nesses inspected the work at proper
times, instead of some so a few
months after.

The 5th witness deposed
that he received Rs. 32 for the
performance of the work in ques-
tion. The facts stated by the 2^d,
3^d & 4th witnesses are of no use.
Therefore there is no ground
whatever to say that the accused
had misappropriated the money.

The Magistrate, finding
that there are no sufficient
grounds either to commit the accused
to trial before the Court
of Sessions or to remand him for
further enquiry, directs that he

unverschuldet und in Section 170
herinn ab. Pised und Code

2/10/76. (Signed) K. Lussing Esq. \$ 95
4

S. By Magistrate
Billary

Good translation

Robertson

J. Dy. Magistrate
Bellary

Register Case No. $\frac{2}{1876}$

Judgment

In this case the accused when an overseer in the Kudlighi Taluk has been charged with Criminal Breach of Trust by having converted to his own use Rs 11-5-8, being the difference of the Estimated sanctioned viz. Rs 56-2-11 mentioned in bills B & D. on account of the repairs executed to the tank (Oodachalamma catta) at Kudlighi. Having spent only Rs 44-13-3, as found on measurement. From the statement of the 1st witness, it appears that the stone and earth work was executed, that the rate charged in the account of earth work of one sort was calculated at 2 annas per Cubic yard, another at 10 annas per Rupee and another at 1 anna per yard, that tamping was charged 4 pice a yard, that 3 1/2 Cubic yards of excavating work, of 108 yards removing earth, 76 1/2 Cubic yards filling in the earth and 108 yards tamping the earth, 18 yards of old stone work, 29 1/4 yards of new stone work, 15 3/4 yards of old stone work near the Caling were executed in July 1875 and examined in December of the same year. From that of

the 2nd witness it appears that he went to work for 3 days as a cooly in digging the bund and that some other coolies were also at work in it; it is not known how much work was performed.

From that of the 3rd witness it appears that he went one day to dig in the Tank as a cooly, and that some others were also employed as such.

The 4th witness deposes to the same effect as the 3rd.

From the evidence of the 5th witness, it would appear that he was present while the 1st and 8th witnesses measured the work, but he is not aware as to when and how much of the work was done.

From that of the 6th it appears that he took the stone work for contract and got it done that as directed by the accused he got the digging the bund and repairing the calingula done by the coolies and that the accused gave him Rs 18 which he (witness) advanced to coolies and which amount was given to him on account of work valued at Rs 23, saying he would give the balance 5 Rs after

wards that the prisoner evaded giving, saying he would do so after receiving the amount from the Superior authorities that he (witness) asked the 8th witness after the accused was removed for money who said that he would give it after examining the accounts but had not done so as yet, that he had received Rs 50 and that when the 8th witness inspected the pits dug for gravel in the Tank, were covered with water.

The 7th witness states that he did work for 5 or 6 days and that 30 or 40 coolies were engaged to work with him.

From the deposition of the 8th witness it appears that on his measurement on 30th Sep. 1875 he found stone work worth Rs 30-12- was performed for the Calingula stone work of Rs 4-8- was done for the Tank bund, earth work of Rs 18 was executed, which amounted to Rs 53-4- that the work was finished by July 1875, that the bills sent in for Rs 53-3- by the accused fell short in consequence of Rs 2-15- and that he did not measure the pits dug for gravel.

The accused pleads that he did execute

the work according to the amount of the bills
he sent in to the Range Office and that he
did not misappropriate the money.

Upon this, although the 1st and 8th
are important witnesses in the case, still
their measurements differ. From facts de-
posed by other witnesses, it seems clear
that the work was executed while there is
nothing to show that the accused committed
criminal breach of trust; Of the documents
produced by the 1st witness the rates on the
bills marked (F) seem to be fair. It is
hard to find out the truth now as the work
was not examined immediately after its
execution. The measurements of the 1st and
8th witnesses differ as the work was examined
a few months after its execution. The 8th
witness says that he did not measure the
pits dug for gravel. Therefore there is no
ground whatever to say that the accused
has misappropriated the money.

There not being sufficient grounds
to commit the accused before the Court
of Sessions for trial, or for remanding
him, the Magistrate directs that he be

12
discharged under Section 195 of the Criminal
Procedure Code.

2nd ^{October} ~~November~~ 1876. / Signed / H. Nursing Row.
J. Dy Magistrate.
Bellary.

/ True translation /

H. Nursing Row
J. Dy Magistrate
Bellary.

Register of the Court of the District of Columbia
1876.

Judgment.

In this case, the 1st witness states that the accused, when he was overseer of the Hospital, taking, submitted a bill to the controlling authority, showing that the work done by the Hospital at Good Hope was valued at Rs 250-0-0. That on the 1st of the work he found that the work executed by the accused was worth only Rs 180-0-0, and he therefore charges the accused with having misappropriated the difference of Rs 70-0-0. He measured the work executed in December 1875, and the work executed in August of the same year. The 2nd witness states that he got the said work done by coolies according to the instructions given by the accused, that he used to get his wages daily as the

Coolies, and the accused paid him Rs 130 for collecting the Coolies.

The 3rd witness states that the work was done by Coolies, and that the accused was with the 1st witness when he had come to take the measurement of the work.

The 4th witness states that the accused submitted a bill for Rs. 296-8- in September 1875, that no estimate was prepared for this work, nor was it approved of. The amount of Rs 400 was placed at the disposal of the accused for any emergent work, in August 1875, that he never inspected the work at any time, that as the estimate was not properly sent in by the accused it was returned, that as he did not see the supply channel at any time he could not say how much work was done, and how much work

was to be done and that the original list of expenditures submitted by the accused is missing.

The prisoner pleads he got the work done for the amount shown in the bill submitted by him, that it being emergent he had it done by Coolies with the permission of the Range officer, and that he cannot account how the work was done by Rs 115-1-9, when it was measured by the 1st witness.

On perusal of the bill produced by the 1st witness, the work entered in it appears to have been done by Coolies. The rates fixed for the work measured and those rates appear to be rather low. The work executed by Coolies will not be equal to those

done by contract. There is no evidence
to show that the work was not done
by the number of Coolies as mentioned
in the bill. It cannot be said
that the list of Coolies is not a
correct one or that the accused
has committed the offence of crim-
inal breach of trust.
There not being sufficient ground
to commit the accused to the Court
of Sessions nor to remand him,
the Magistrate directs that he be
discharged under Section 195,
Criminal Procedure Code.
2/10/76 (Signed) K. Narsing Rao.
J. Deputy Magistrate
Ballari.
/True Translation/
A. M. M. S. S. S.
J. Deputy Magistrate
Ballari.

16/1/1876

Reported case No. 1876-1
In the case of the accused
when he was an overseer in the
Kudligy Taluk, situated in the taluk
of Kuvcoola in Kudligy Taluk,
with Rs. 3-8-0 and charged in the
bill the amount of Rs. 48-8-0 and
has misappropriated the sum of
Rs. 48-0-0 thereby he is liable to
be charged with criminal breach
of trust.
By the deposition of the 1st witness
it appears that 21 children of
Kuvcoola near the Bahing Taluk, the
there is a difference in the value
of unburnt and burnt children, that
their rates were not known, that
it was not known if children
having been heaped up that the
children which was pointed
out by the accused was not
taken into account for
that it was not intended for
the children, that the value
of the children was Rs. 5-0-0.

By the evidence of the 2^d witness
it is clear that, as the accused
contracted with him to spread
stones in the calingulah and to
wall it in, he (witness) had
the work wanted for some days
by Wanda, that he, having
assigned the work to another
to get it performed, went away
to be so up in the city, that
he signed a receipt for having
received money, that he could
not say the exact amount of the
said receipt, that probably
he might have received
Rs 40. That the foundation was
laid for the construction of the
front part of the calingulah &
that the accused & his men
Rs 30 through Sarama for
hauling the chunam and
stones heaped up.

The 3^d witness states that he
saw the work when it was
being done, and that he
did not know how much of
it was finished.

The 4th witness states that
he saw the work when it was

under progress, and that he is
not sure how much work was
done. 16
The 5th 6th & 7th witnesses state
that the work was under progress
and that the stones were
being heaped up.
The 8th witness states that there
were 24 cubic yards of stones
in the calingulah, that the
value of those stones would
be Rs 6, that no other materials
were collected near the work
in calingulah, that the accused
was not with him, that he did
not remember having asked
for any stones or for
the collection of materials any
where, that generally the rate
there for new stone work is 8
Rs for a cubic yard, that the
old stone work is 3 Rs
a piece, that the old stone
work 4 Rs a piece, that a
square yard of earth work is 2 Rs
a cubic yard, that a kind of
chunam is Rs 3-8-1, that he
did not know what sort of work

was unnecessary for the Calingulab
and that there was no order
to show what other materials
were collected there.

The prisoner states that
he prepared an estimate for Rs.
174 for the construction of the
calingulab & sent it in first
instance to the Range officer.
That he contracted with Venkita
Kannamma for the collection
of stones & chunam.
That he gave her Rs 25 after
he (Venkita Kannamma) heaped
up some stones & chunam
and also gave her Rs 6-6-
to Waddayabettu to remove
stones out of the Calingulab.
That, as there was no money
with him, he did not give
Rs 27-2- mentioned in the bill
marked (d). That, as he went
away to Kurnool afterwards
on other duty, he did not know
whether the amount was
paid or not. That, though he
was present at the time
of the measurement by

the 1st witness, he did not point out
what work he executed because
he was not asked. That he heaped
some stones two miles off from
the Calingulab & some chunam
at Goundanabulky.
Considering the facts, it seems
not appear, that the work was
executed after sanction was obtained
for the estimate or what work
was to be done, or for what
amount it was to be executed &
that the examination was made
in proper time. The 1st & 2nd
witnesses are important for
the case. The valuation of the
work mentioned by these wit-
nesses varies. Not only the
accused but also a witness
says that some stones and
chunam were heaped up. It
does not appear that these heaps
were inspected & valued. The
accused, admitting the bill
marked a, b, c, states that
the amount of the bill (d)
was not paid. This even the
1st witness admits. It does

not seem that the foundation work & the heaping up of stones & chimneys at a distant place were estimated & included in the account. The rate at which the earth work is charged in the bill marked (a) seems fair. The rates at which stones and charged in (b) appear rather excessive in bill (a). Those in the bill (d) at which new stones & chimneys are charged seem fair. Of the amount expended by the prisoner mainly Rs 51-6- the 2^d witness acknowledges, as that he received Rs 45. The 4th witness & chemist named in the bill (a) for Rs 6-6- states that he did not receive money nor did he do any work. The accused states that another person of the same name did the foundation work. There is no evidence whatever to show especially that the prisoner has committed criminal breach of trust by misappropriating Govt money. He regularly received orders from the beginning to the end & examination here

could not in proper time, then it would have been easy to ascertain the real state of affairs. A few months after the execution of the work, measurement was made by the 1st & 8th witnesses in the absence of & without questioning the accused. Consequently it is concluded that there is no sufficient evidence against the prisoner.

There not being sufficient grounds to commit the accused before the Court of Sessions nor to remand him to the Magistrate's Court; that he (Johnson) be discharged under Sec: 195 of the C. P. C.

2/10/76 (Signed) R. Manning Sec.

J. Dy. Magistrate

Bellary

True translation

R. Manning

J. Dy. Magistrate

Bellary

No. 4297

District Engineer's Office,
BELLARY,
P. W. DEPARTMENT,
1877

FROM The Dy. District Engineer
TO THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Enclosures. 6

Reference is made to the proceedings of the
Court of Sessions at Bellary dated 14th September last
concerning the petition of the said Government Officer in
the further prosecution of Mr. Johnson late
acting District Officer in the Hooghly District
of the Hooghly Range, I have the honor
to report, with much regret, that

the temporary Dy. Magistrate who tried the
case as per margin against him in the 10th
District Court has thrown them out and the man
has been acquitted of even the minor charge
of attempt at cheating.

Considerable delay has occurred in fur-
nishing this report owing in the first place
from the delay I experienced in obtaining
copies of the judgments in the cases which
I now forward for your information and secondly
from the pressure of other duties during the
last few weeks which I need not detail.

- 1. Neucounta land case
- 2. Oda chalam land case
- 3. Naddichully land case
- 4. Somarghary land case
- 5. Kumbhary land case
- 6. Gaudie land case

Amongst the Valsels of the Delany
Court I could not find one who would undertake
the prosecution as they were all fully employed
and the Government Valsel it regret to say
reported sick and was unable to attend during
the trial.

As the trials appear to me to have
been conducted in an unsatisfactory manner
and as the man has again been acquitted
I have the honour to request instructions
as to any further proceedings against him
for there are 12 more cases to be disposed of

I have the honour to

Yours faithfully

Wm. P. Mc

Off. District Engineer

Bellevue

DAVID
FRANK

20

Handwritten notes and signatures on the right page, including a large signature that appears to be "David Frank".

Memorandum 8978 31-5-76
 " 911 5-6-76
 " 1034 4-7-76
 Memo: 71 14-9-76

P. W. D
 5 JAN. 77
 No. 93

Dated 3rd January 1877
 Recd. *Encl. 1*
 No. 4097
*Mr. Johnson. Please
 the further results of
 the prosecution of, and
 awarding notice*

FROM
 THE *Off. Secy. to Govt.*
 D. P. W.
 TO
 Chief Engineer &
 THE SECRETARY TO GOVT.,
 P. W. DEPARTMENT.

No. 158-
 Ci: 6-1-77. 12-1-77

Public Works Department.

No. 84

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 10 Jan 77
 Read the following.

From
 The Offg. District Engineer
 Bellary } (No. 4097 of 30 Jan 1877)

Recorded.
 2. 'The Government are not
 of opinion that further pro-
 secution of the case would
 be desirable.
Amr

Dist. Engineer, Bellary.
 Es. P. W. D.
 J. L. D. P.
 18-1-77

Govt. of 1877 Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

To

The R. E. Bellary

Dated

Issued

Recd.

Encl.

G. O., *10th Dec.* 1877, No. 84.

Nos. 158 & 159.

*Mr. Johnson, late Quereau
Respect Ranger Bellary
District. - Passing order on
letter from the District
Engineer reporting result
of the prosecution of —*

South Bellary