A5
B5
A4
B5
B4
A4
A3

Archives 1—10,000—6-10-76.

(1) Number of pages 34

(2) Date of repair 13-3-86

(3) Initials of the Referencer Ravi

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W.D DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. / B.P. No.	2,44-W	Press. / Mis.
Dated	10-6-1878	197 .

R.R

Not to be folded or roughly handled

2444
1

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

10th June 1878, No. 2,444 W.

General Establishment.

Read the following papers :—

No. 69. From S. SARAVANAMOOTTOO PILLAY, to the Chief Engineer and Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madras, 27th April 1878.

I HAVE the honor to bring to your notice that I have supplied the District Engineer of Nellore with 10,414 bags of rice under contract from September 1877 to November 1877 and obtained receipts from the Range Officers and Overseers of the Buckingham Canal for 10,214½ bags, for which I submitted bills to the extent of Rupees 1,41,024-14-0. The District Engineer paid me Rupees 1,35,929-11-10, and has kept back the balance of Rupees 5,095-2-2. Repeated applications have been made by myself and my bankers for the payment of this sum during the past five months, and up to the 20th April instant neither of us have been favored with any reply.

2. On the 20th April current the District Engineer furnishes me with a statement in which he makes out that a balance of Rupees 1,284-6-7 is due by me. The process by which he arrives at this result, I respectfully submit, will be found on examination to be altogether irreconcilable as to facts, and the only way in which I can account for the result against me is that the District Engineer has been calculating the tare weight of the gunny bags at the rate of two gunnies to a bag, whereas I have been using only a single gunny for all the bags I have supplied, giving the net weight of each bag at 160 lbs. in accordance with the terms of the contract.

3. By the process just pointed out the District Engineer shows in column No. 6 of his statement a deficiency in weight equivalent to 142¾ bags. Against this result I respectfully beg permission to place on record that when Dr. O'Hara, of the Nellore District, examined and weighed several of my bags long after they were supplied he found the weight of the bags to exceed that of the Range Officers.

4. I have further respectfully to point out that when the bags were tendered for delivery the District Engineer had no godowns wherein to stow them, and consequently a large number of them are likely to be damaged by exposure, and their contents are likely, also, to be extracted by the famine-stricken people.

5. I am not aware whether the subordinates of the District Engineer had any scales to weigh the rice; but I am in a position to state they had no stamped iron weights, and, in order to ascertain the quantity in each bag, had recourse to common stones, which they used for weights. I need hardly point out how unreliable the weights so obtained would be for the purpose of adjusting my claim as contractor;

and what a contrast this is to the method adopted by me in ascertaining the weight by proper scales and stamped iron weights before the despatch of bags from Madras.

6. I beg leave respectfully further to add that the District Engineer had actually returned the security money lodged with him for the due fulfilment of my contract, and I submit that had there been an actual deficiency of the quantity of rice supplied, or had there been any infringement of the terms of the contract on my part, that an official of the District Engineer's experience will not so return the security money without in the first instance inflicting the penalty I have rendered myself liable for.

7. For nearly eight months after these transactions have taken place no question has been raised as to short weight or short delivery, but at the expiration of this long period, and after the rice supplied by me has been all consumed and made use of, and no means of verifying the accuracy of the District Engineer's calculations in his statement are available, instead of paying the sum of Rupees 5,095-2-2 due to me, a most extraordinary statement is prepared, and I am called upon to refund Rupees 1,284-6-7.

8. I now respectfully submit that every one of my bills was supported by receipts granted by the subordinates of the District Engineer for quantities actually delivered to them, and I beg that you will be good enough to call for my bills submitted from time to time with these receipts attached and pass the necessary orders for payment to me of what is due.

No. 1,950.

REFERRED to the District Engineer, Nellore, for report.

2. It is desirable that this amount should be adjusted as speedily as possible.

(Signed) E. A. FOORD, Colonel, R.E.,
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

1st May 1878.

No. 69-A. From J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, Esq., District Engineer, Nellore, to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated Nellore, 3rd June 1878, No. 558.

IN returning Contractor Saravanamoottoo Pillay's letter, dated the 27th April 1878, forwarded to me for report with your endorsement, No. 1,950, dated the 1st May 1878, I have the honor to enclose a statement (A) which shows that the contractor delivered 10,354 bags of rice, of which 461 bags were rejected and taken back by the contractor, leaving only 9,893 bags to be accounted for by this department.

2. In comparing this statement with the receipts granted by the Executive Officer and which have been sent to me by the contractor, an error of 10 bags has been discovered in favor of the contractor and the actual number of bags for which receipts were granted is 9,903.

3. The contract specifies that the *gross* weight of each bag should be 164 lbs. and the *net* weight 160 lbs. The statement A as well as the receipts (which I may observe here have been accepted without question by the contractor) prove that the gross weight of the bags when delivered is, with the exception of *one* consignment of 650 bags, much less than the stipulated weight of 164 lbs., and the 9,903 bags of different weights delivered are (*vide* statement B) equal to only 9,762 $\frac{47}{100}$ bags of the stipulated weight of 164 lbs. per bag.

4. The terms of the agreement in this respect was unfortunately lost sight of in my office and the contractor was paid for 9,841 bags at the stipulated rate and his security deposit was refunded before the mistake was discovered.

5. The following is a complete abstract of the contractor's account :—

		BAGS.	
Actually delivered		9,903	
		RS.	A. P.
Reduced to 164 lbs. each = 9,762·47 bags at Rs. 13-13-0	=	1,34,844	1 10
Paid for 9,841·04 bags at Rs. 13-13-0	=	1,35,929	11 10
Excess paid, 78·57 bags	=	1,085	10 0
Add amount advanced to contractor's agent for unloading boats		30	0 0
Total due by Contractor ...		1,115	10 0

6. The difference between this amount (Rupees 1,115-10-0) and the amount of refund lately claimed from the contractor (Rupees 1,284-6-7) is caused by the error of the ten bags noticed in paragraph 2 above and to some trifling errors in calculation.

7. The excess payment should not of course have been made, and for this I am responsible; but to meet the urgent demands and the undoubted necessity for speedy payments, the receipts of Overseers had sometimes to be conditionally accepted, and these receipts having been subsequently modified by the Range Officer some confusion arose which caused the mistake to be made. The law will no doubt allow for this if legal means become necessary for the recovery of the money; but, considering the social and commercial position of the contractor and his agents, who are in my opinion also concerned, recourse to the law will probably be avoided: any objection on the part of one or the other to refund money which is not theirs and which was paid to them by mistake was not anticipated.

8. The contractor's statement that a sum of Rupees 5,095-2-2 is due to him is incorrect. A bill for Rupees 5,205-13-2, dated 13th October 1877, had to be referred to the Range Officer for verification and was not paid; this amount was included in a subsequent bill for Rupees 13,743-7-0, dated the 22nd October 1877, and an order for the payment of this bill was issued by me on the 30th October 1877.

9. The contractor's statement that he used single instead of double bags is on reference to the Range Officer found to be correct, and the contractor would gain by this arrangement the difference between the cost of a single or double bag or about 2 Annas per bag. This alone would amount on 9,903 bags to Rupees 1,237-7-0, which is more than the amount now in question.

10. The empty bags are of little or no value to us, and it is true that so long as we received 160 lbs. of rice in each bag it would be all the same so far as the interests of Government are concerned whether the bags were single or double or weighed 2 lbs. or 4 lbs., though as shown above the use of single bags would if allowed be a source of profit to the contractor.

11. I have ascertained that the empty bags really weigh just under 2 lbs. each, and if the contractor's view of the case could be accepted the account would stand as follows :—

9,762·47 bags of 164 lbs. a bag are equal to 9,882·99 of 162 lbs. per bag, and 9,882·99 at Rs. 13-13-0 ...	=	RS. 1,36,568	A. P. 12 9
Paid 9,841·04 at Rs. 13-13-0	=	1,35,929	11 10
Difference 41·95 at Rs. 13-13-0	=	579	0 11
Deduct advance to contractor's agent		30	0 0
Balance due to contractor		549	0 11

It might be in accordance with the spirit of the contract to accept this view of the case, while the statement which shows the contractor to have been overpaid is certainly upheld by the letter of the agreement. I request you will decide which is to be adopted.

12. The contractor's representations of the manner in which the rice was received, &c., are not quite accurate. It is true the means of weighing and storing the rice was not by any means perfect, but I received no complaints of a serious nature in these respects when the rice was being delivered.

No. 70. ORDER THEREON, 10th June 1878, No. 2,444 W.

THE District Engineer will arrange for disbursing the balance of Rs. 549-0-11, which is considered to be due to the contractor.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) E. A. FOORD, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

(True Copy.)

Major, R.E.,
Under Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the District Engineer, Nellore.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts.
" Petitioner without letters.

Exd. T. D. Ryan.
Spare Copies

GENERAL
ESTABLISHMENT.

Estt. of (1878) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd. June 1878.

Read

Letd.

Entd.

G. O., 10th June 1878, No. 1441 W.

JUNE.

Nos. 69-70.

Recommending Policy, Rate Contractor—
District Engineer, Bellary, recommended for the
Purchase Contract of Lingsugur Tank Channel.

No 111 Mint Street 2464/1
Madras 27 April 1878.

To
Colonel C. A. Turnbull R.E.
Chief Engineer & Secretary to Govt
of Madras Public Works.

Fort St. George.

Sir

I have the honor to bring to your notice, that I have supplied the Assistant Engineer of Nellore with 10,000 Bags Rice under contract from September 1877 to November 1877 and I herewith forward the Receipt Officers and overseers of the Buckingham Canal for 10,000 Bags, for which I submitted Bills to the extent of Rupees 11,000. The Assistant Engineer paid me Rs. 135.939. 11. 10, and has kept back the balance of Rs. 5095. 2. 2.

Repeated applications have been made by myself and my Banker for the payment of this amount, during the last five months, and up to the 20th of last month of no have been favored with any reply.

On the 20th instant, the Assistant Engineer forwarded me with a statement, in which he makes out, that a balance of Rupees 1288. 6. 7 is due by me. The Invoices by

about be owned at the present, I respectfully submit, will be found an exemplification to be altogether irreconcilable with fact, and the only way we think I can account for the present apparent error is, that the District Engineer has been calculating the tare weight of the Gunny Bags, at the rate of two pounds to a bag, whereas I do not know among only a couple gunny for all the Bags I have supplied, giving the net weight of each Bag at 160 lbs, in accordance with the terms of the contract. By the present fresh parcel of the District Engineers the new one Column Sch of his statement a deficiency in weight equivalent to 112 Bags. Against this result, I respectfully beg permission to place on record, with the Orders of the Above District engineer and weighed several of my Bags long after they were supplied, to be found the weight of the Bags to exceed that of the Ranges officers.

I have further respectfully to point out, that when the Bags were tendered for delivery, the District Engineer had no doubt every reference to stamp them, and consequently a large number of them are likely to be damaged by

by exposure, and their contents are likely also to be entombed by the former Gunny Bags.

July 4

I am told among other that the subordinate District Engineer, had any doubts to weigh the Rice, but I am in a position to state they had no stamped brass weights, and in order to ascertain the gravity in the Bag, had recourse to common stones, which they used for weights. I need hardly point out, how unreliable the weights so stones would be, for the purpose of ascertaining any claim a contractor, and that a contract there to be rejected by some, on uncertainty the weight, by former scales and stamped brass weights before the District Engineers from Mr Dees.

I beg leave respectfully further to add that the District Engineer had actually returned the Gunny Bags lodged with him for the due fulfilment of my contract, and I submit, that had there been any actual deficiency of the quantity of Rice supplied, or had there been any infringement of the terms of the contract on my part, that an officer of the District Engineers Department, will not be returned the security money, until at the final instance after fully

H.L.

think he ought to receive, I respectfully
submit, will be found an exemption
to be altogether unreconcileable with facts,
and the only way in which I can account
for the wealth against me is that
the Contract Engineer has been calculating
the tare weight of the Gunny Bags, at the
rate of two grammes to a bag, whereas
It was been using only a single gunny
for all the Bags above specified, giving
the net weight of each Bag at 160 lbs, in
accordance with the terms of the contract.
By the process just pointed out, the
District Engineer also may Column
No 4 of his statement a deficiency in
weight appears about to the 14 Bags against
his wealth, I respectfully beg permission
to plead in mitigation, that when Portions
of the above deficits are measured out,
weights several of my Bags long after
they were supplied, it be found the
weight of the Bags to exceed that of the
Range officers

I have further respectfully to point
out, that when the Bags were tendered
for delivery, the District Engineer had
no power whatever to stamp them,
and consequently a large number
of them are likely to be damaged

by enforcement, and their contents are likely
also to be extracted by the famine stricken
people.

Lastly and more whether the subordinate of
District Engineer, had any orders to weigh
the Rice, but I am in a position to state
they had no stamped bore weights, and
in order to ascertain the quantity in each
Bag, had recourse to common stones
which they used for weights. I need hardly
point out, how unreliable the weights
so obtained would be, for the purpose
of adjusting any claim or contention,
and what a contrast there is to the method
adopted by me, in ascertaining the
weight, by proper scales and stamped
brass weights before the despatch of Bags
from Store.

I beg leave respectfully further to add,
that the District Engineer had actually
returned the Security money lodged with
him for the due fulfilment of my
contract, and I submit, that had
there been any actual deficiency of
the quantity of Rice supplied, or had
there been any infringement of the terms
of the contract on my part, that on receipt
of the District Engineers reference, with me
to return the Security money, without in
the first instance affording the Penalty

I have received myself bills from
for nearly eight months after these
operations have taken place, no
mention has been made as to what
weight or short delivery, but at the
expiration of this long period, and
after the bills submitted by me have
been all examined, and made out
by, and to the satisfaction of
the Secretary of the District Engineers
Calculations in his statement are
available, instead of paying the
sum of Rupees 3098-2-2 due to me,
I am retaining claimed is
exposed, and I am called upon to
refund Rupees 1886-7.
I have respectfully submit, that every
one of my bills was submitted
by myself personally to the district
Engineer for payment
duly drawn to them, and
they did not make last
remark to me for my bills
submitted from time to time
with their receipts attached, and
how the money order for
payment to me of this

2464/2

is due.

I have the honour to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

[illegible]

No. 1950

Referred to the District
Engineer Nellore for report.
It is desirable that this amount
should be adjusted as speedily
as possible.

Edmd Col. R.E.
Chief Engr. P.W.D.

1st. May 1878

To the District Engineer Nellore
in original to be returned.

A

Return of Price delivered by contractor Saravanamuttu Pillay to the Executive Officer
Vavuniya Division

2145/6

Station	Date	Bags received	Bags rejected	Lbs paid for	Overseer or Range Officer
Caravandel C—	26 September 77	2000 bags at 162½ lbs		2000	Vide Indorsement No 626 dated 20th October on Inv Francis's receipt
	30th Do — 600	599 do at 160-3, 168/169 ⅓		599	Vide Range Officer's receipt No 691 dated 23/11/77
	8th Octo — 1100				
	16th do — 650				
	1st November 599				
Settipatte —	30th Sept — 360	1,996 at 160¾ lbs		1996	Vide do receipt No 625 dated 20-10-77
	4th Octo — 1636	1,834 at 162¾ lbs	19	1815	Vide do receipt No 692 dated 23-11-77
	25th Novbr 1,854				
Cavendar —	30th Septr — 457	1,139 at 163 13/16 lbs	"	1139	Vide do receipt No 624 of 20th October 77
	11th Octo — 682				
Durgaragapatam	8th October 1877	1,251 at 160 lbs 9 oz	"	1251	Vide do receipt No 691 of 23rd November 77
	4th October 1877	838 at 162 lbs	"	838	Vide do receipt No 592 of 10th October 77
Kurunagalam	11 October 1877	697 at 151 lbs	462	255	Vide do receipt No 691 of 28 November 77
Total C		10,354	461	9,893	

Note — Receipts more given by Overseers immediately on receipt of price from the Contractor and a small part payments are made by the District Engineer.

25 January 1878

True Copy
A Thurairajah
District Engineer

Signed J.H. Stephens
Range Officer

HL

B

Abstract of Contractor M. Saravanamuttan Pillay's account with the Distrt Engineer, Nellore

Station	Onecaum's receipt Date	Onecaum's receipt No of Bags	Range Office's receipt Date	Range Office's receipt No of Bags	Weight in lbs	Equalt to No of Bags of 164 lbs	Rate	Amount
Coromandal	24th Septr 1877	360	20 Octr 1877.	1,350	162	1,333 · 52		
	9th October 1877	400		650	164	650 · -		
	16th Do	650						
		1410		2,000				
	2nd Novemr 1877	600	23rd Novr	599	16a 9/16	586 · 45		
		2,010		2,599				
Tettapat	25th Septembr	360	20th October 1877	1,996	160 3/4	1956 · 45		
	4th October	1,636	23rd Novembr	1,815	162 3/4	1,801 · 17		
		1,996		3,811				
Duganarupalam	1st October	596						
	7th Do	665	23rd Novembr	1,261	160 9/16	1,234 · 57		
		1261						
Cushaba	"	"	20th October	1,139	163 13/16	1137 · 71		
Krishnapatnam	"	"	23rd Novr 1877	838	162	827 · 72		
	"		"	255	151	234 · 80		
				1093				
Grand Total		9,903				9,762 · 47	13 13 -	134,843-1-10
Payment already made						9841 · 04	13 13 -	135929-1-10
Differance Over paid								1,085-10--
Money advanced								30 --
Total due by Contractor								1115-10--

District Engineer's Office
Nellore
3rd June 1878

R Thuraiswamy.
District Engineer

No 558 Encl 3

District Engineer Office
Galle
1st June 1878

Sir,

I have the honor to forward
herewith for your information
the Abstract Engineers
Estimate
&c.
of the Colpetty
Public Works Department
for the
Year 1878.

Sir,
Your obedient servant
Secretary Municipal Council Galle

dated the 27th April 1878 forwarding
to me for report and observation
memo No 1950 dated the 1st instant
I have the honor to enclose an
statement (A) which shows that
the Contract allowed 1965 lineal
of piles, of which 461 lineal were rejected
and taken back by the Contractor
leaving only 1893 lineal to be accounted
for by this Assistant.

In comparing this statement

with the receipts granted by the Executive Office and which have been sent to me by the contractor an error of 10 bags has been discovered in favor of the contractor and the actual number of bags for which receipts were granted is 9903.

The contract specifies that the gross weight of each bag should be 164 lbs and the net weight 160 lbs. The statement A as well as the receipts which Spinney observed have been accepted without question by the contractor / prove that the gross weight of the bags when delivered is with the exception of one consignment of 650 bags much less than the stipulated weight of 164 lbs, and the 9903 bags of different weights delivered are (vide statement

Equal to only 97 62 47/164 bags of the stipulated weight of 164 lbs per bag. 2464/12

The terms of the agreement in this respect was manifestly made by him in light of in my Office and the Contractor was paid for 9,841 bags at the stipulated rate and his security deposit was refunded before the mistake was discovered.

The following is a Complete abstract of the Contractors account —

actually delivered	9903 bags		
Reduced to 164 lbs each	7762·67 bags	@ Rs 13-13-	= 134,848-1-10
Paid for	7841·04 bags	@ Rs 13-13-	= 135,929-11-10
Excess paid	78·37 bags	=	1085-10-0
Add amount advanced to Contractor's agent for embarking Coals			30-0-0
Total due by Contractor			1115-10-0

The difference between the amount

Proper ——— 1,115—10—0

and the amount of

proposed Late Claimed } 1,284—6—7

from the Contractor

is caused by the error of the 10 bags

noticed in para 2 above and to

some trifling errors in Calculation.

The excess payment refunded

not of course have been made

and for this I am responsible,

but to meet the urgent demands

and the undoubted necessity

for speedy payments, the receipts

of Overseers for the sanctioned to

be conditionally accepted and

those receipts bearing Level

certificate countersigned by the

Range Officer some Confirmation

above to which cause the payable

to be made. The Law will, no doubt

allow for this if legal proceedings

become necessary for the recovery

of the money; but considering

the social and Commercial position

of the Contractor and his agents

who are in my opinion also concerned

recourse to the Law will probably

be avoided, any objection on the

part of one or the other to refund

money which is not theirs and

which have spent to them by mistake

was not anticipated.

The Contractor's statement that

a sum of Rs 6,095—2—2 is due

to him is incorrect, a bill for

Rs 5,205—13—2 dated 13th October

1877 had to be passed to the

Range Officer for verification

and was not found; this amount

The difference between this amount

Paper 1115-10-0

and the amount of refund lately claimed from the Contractor } 1284-6-7

is caused by the error of the 10 bags noticed in para 2 above and to some trifling errors in calculation.

The cheque payment should not of course have been made and for this I am responsible, but to meet the urgent demands and the undoubted necessity for speedy payments, the receipts of Overseers for deliveries to be conditionally accepted and these receipts having been subsequently superseded by the Range Officer's Certificates which could not be made. The Law will no doubt allow for this if legal means 1414/- become necessary for the recovery of the money, but considering the social and Commercial position of the Contractor and his agents who are in my opinion also concerned recourse to the Law will probably be avoided, any objection on the part of one or the other to refund money which is not theirs and which was fraudulently obtained was not anticipated.

The Contractor's statement that a sum of Rs 5,095-2-2 was due to him on account, a bill for Rs 5,205-13-2 dated 13th October 1877 had to be passed by the Range Officer for verification and was not passed; this amount

was included in a subsequent
bill for Rs 13743-7-0 dated the
22nd October 1877 and an order for
the payment of this bill was
signed by me on the 30th October 1877.
The contractor's statement
that he used single instead
of double bags in connection to
the Range Officer found to be
correct and the Contractor would
gain by this arrangement; the
difference between the cost of a
single or double bag or about 2
as per bag, this alone would
amount to 9,903 bags £1,237-7-0
which is more than the
amount now in question.
The empty bags are of little or no
value to me and it is time that
a bag as was received, 160 lbs
of rice in each bag it would be

all the same so far as the Commissariat
of Government are concerned whether
the bags were single or double or
weighed 2 lbs or 4 lbs. Though
as shewn above the use of single
bags would if allowed be a source
of profit to the Contractor.
I have ascertained that the
empty bags really weigh just under
2 lbs each and if the Contractor's
view of the case could be accepted
the account would stand as follows.
9,762·47 bags of 164 lbs a bag are
equal to 9,882·99 of 162 lbs per bag.
and 9,882·99 at 13-13-0 = 136,508-29
Paid 9,841·46 at 13-13-0 = 135,929-11-0
Difference 41·95 at 13-13-0 = 579-0-11
Deduct advance to Contractor
of 30-0-0
Balance due to Contractor 549-0-11
It might be in accordance with the

24447/14

spirit of the Contract. As accept
thereview of the Case while the
statement which shows the Contractor
to have been overpaid is certainly
upheld by the Letter of the agreement,
I regret to say the decide which is
to be adopted.—

The Contractors representations
of the manner in which the
Iron was received are not quite
accurate. It is true the process of
weighing and stowing the Iron was
not by any means perfect, but
I received from Constants of a
serious nature in their respects when
the Iron was being delivered.

I have the honor to be
Your Most Obedient Servant

[illegible]
Assistant Engineer

Office 29

From

The District Engineer
Nellore

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.
Madras

No 558
Dated 3rd June 1878
Despatched 10th do
Received

Enclosures 3

Saramanamuthu Pillay
Rice Contractor —
Returns the petition of —
and submits an
account regarding the
adjustment of his
claims.

To Corby 6-6-78.

Ctd 8-6-78. Ltd 10-6-78

Public Works Department.

No 2444

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

2444/78

Under date the 10 June 78

Read the following:—

From S. Saravana Muthu (No — d/27th April 78)

From the Dist Engr Nellore/ H.E. No. 558 d/3rd June 1878/

The District
Engineer Pillivarian &c
for ~~Money~~ disbursing
the balance of Rs 549-0-11
which is considered to
be due to the Contractor

Rs 549-0-11

Rs 549-0-11

The Dist Engr Nellore
Exd. P. W. Accts
To the Petitioner (Copy of PO. only
& No enclosures
to letter)

Date 26-6-78

6403 87

Govt. of (1878) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS

To

A S Kelne

Dated

Inward

Read. Encl.

G. O. 10th June 1878. No. Letter

Nos. 869/70

Saravana mudhaliar Pillai

Rice Contractor.

Disp Kellaie adcl.

& disburse the balance

of Rs 379-0-11 due to —

Secretary