

- (1) Number of pages 62
 (2) Date of repair 28.4.86 to 30.4.86
 (3) Initials of the Referencer bml

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P. W. D. DEPARTMENT

G.O. No. 3 *W.* Press. 5 Mis.

Dated 2.1.1878 197

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

2nd January 1878, No. 3 W.

General-

Establishment-

Read the following paper:—

No. 5. From W. S. HARRINGTON, Esq., District Engineer, Madura, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Madura, 22nd December 1877, No. 268.

With reference to your No. 3,627, dated 30th October, I have the honor to state that, as directed in G.O., No. 2,792, dated

- 1 Judgment with its translation.
- 1 Decree.
- 1 Copy of a letter from the Divisional Range Officer, to the District Engineer, No. 2,015, dated 10th October 1877.
- 1 Copy of statement of receipts and expenditure.
- 1 Copy of correspondence between Divisional Range Officer and Messrs. Hicky and Hickry.
- 1 Copy of notice.
- 1 Copy of docket from the Divisional Range Officer to the District Engineer, No. 2,823, dated 18th December 1877.

17th October 1876, I submitted copy of the judgment of the Court for the information and orders of Government.

2. But, as I am desired to give the facts of the case clearly, I have the honor to report as follows:—

From Lieutenant Boddy's letter, printed with G.O., No. 2,792, dated 17th October 1876, it appears sufficiently evident that a sum of Rupees 756-9-5 was due by Contractor "Soobramania Pillay"

after a final measurement of the whole of the work done by him. I venture to express an opinion that Lieutenant Boddy should at once have proceeded against him on these grounds, instead of which he allowed the Contractor to take the initiative and to bring the present suit which is for the payment of a separate sum of Rs. 600, being the value of certain stones brought since a payment of Rupees 4,500-11-6 was made; this is admitted by the defendant, and this being so I do not see that the Munsif could do otherwise than he did, viz., give judgment in favor of the plaintiff, without paying any heed to the counter claim of the defendant for Rupees 756-9-5, which appears to have been improperly brought forward at that particular time; it should, I imagine, have formed altogether a distinct claim and have been urged long ago and prior to the institution of the present suit. I am no lawyer and do not of course presume to urge the matter from a legal point of view; I merely state these facts for the information of Government and request to be permitted to pay into Court the sum stated by the Munsif to be due, viz., Rupees 720-6-9, as per notice received with Mr. Paynter's No. 2,823 of the 18th instant, as also Rupees 25-8-6, being the amount claimed by the Vakeels engaged to conduct the suit for the defendant.

3. I beg your attention to the expression of the Munsif's opinion that a fresh suit should be filed against Contractor "Soobramania Pillay," Mr. Overseer Williams who overmeasured the work and prepared the bills, and Mr. Hawksworth who paid the Contractor the 25 per cent. withheld by Lieutenant Greer. It is not for me to decide whether such a suit should or should not be filed, but I fear that if instituted it might not be successful, both Mr. Hawksworth and Mr. Williams having died since. "Mooroogasa Moodelly," the present Taluk Overseer of Dindigul, might however be cited as a witness and perhaps a material one.

4. I may mention in conclusion that "V. Soobramania Iyer," the Government Pleader at Madura, whose opinion I asked regarding the case hinted at "collusion," but on whose part he would not state.

No. 5.

ORDER THEREON, 2nd January 1878, No. 3 W.

THE District Engineer will pay into Court the sum of Rupees 720-6-9.

2. It is very plain that the counter claim against the plaintiff should have been made before the present case arose, and in its not being made Lieutenant Boddy showed want of judgment.

(True Extract.)

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

To the District Engineer, Madura.
" Superintending Engineer, Kistna.
" Examiner of Public Works Accounts.

Ed. E. C. Shunker.
Spare Copies

Original suit No. 377 of 1877

Judgment

2

Soobramania Iyer

Plaintiff

Boddy Esquire

Defendant

While the Plaintiff was conducting work on contract in the third Division on the Road No. 5 leading to Cheekanoory in the Diindigul Range, he was directed on the 16th March 1876 by Quarter Whinnasammy Pillay to stop all work except that of spreading stones. The sum viz Rs. 832 sued for by the Plaintiff includes the amount retrenched on his Bill till that date and the amounts to which he is entitled as the value of the work done in the process of levelling & tampering and of stone breaking according to the work under which last measurement has been taken by the Defendant including the value of gravel heaps and earth work measured by the Quarter. After the contract was cancelled the Quarter appropriated the unbroken stones that remained on the work and the Plaintiff claiming Rs. 285-4- from the Quarter the value thereof, under a

report submitted by the Plaintiff - he was directed in an order dated 31st December 1875 to appear personally before the Defendant at Sindigub. He accordingly made his appearance on the 13th & 14th February 1876 but was told to draw the money from the Piceolum sub Division officer to whom, he was informed, that an order would be sent, but nothing of the kind happened and the payment of the amount due to him was being evaded by the Defendant. Consequently the Plaintiff claims Rs 832 minus 232 (which he has no desire for) the Plaintiff stating that the price of stones above stated will be sued for in another suit.

2. The Defendant states in his defence that nothing is due to the Plaintiff for the work executed by the latter on contract and that Plaintiff has overdrawn Rs 756-9-5 under the following circumstances. As shown in exhibit No I the Plaintiff has drawn on several occasions Rs 1,500-11-6 for stones measuring 3600 $\frac{55}{76}$ yds. which the Plaintiff states to have been used

on the road. When however the measurement was taken for the last time it appeared that the Plaintiff had collected only 297 $\frac{3}{4}$ yds. of stones and that those having not been broken and spread over the road according to the estimate, the real cost amounted only to Rs 3118-7-9 leaving an excess amount of Rs 13821-3-9 which had been paid to the Plaintiff. The sum due to the Plaintiff for having conducted work after the last occasion he drew money is Rs 551-1-4 and this together with Rs 74-9- which was outstanding on the last bill of the Plaintiff comes to Rs 625-10-4. Deducting this amount from the excess amount already drawn by the Plaintiff a balance of Rs 756-9-5 is left still due by the Plaintiff as above set forth. The Defendant further states that the Overseer did not take away any stones from the Plaintiff after the cancellation of the contract and that in consequence of the Plaintiff not having broken the stones and spread them over the road as per terms of contract, this work has been conducted by the Government.

3. Exhibits produced by the Plaintiff

(A) The contract measurement account No 2 of 26th May 1875 of the road mentioned in the Plaintiff's

(L) The contract measurement account of 26th June 1873
of the road mentioned in the Court

(C) do do No 7 of 31st March 1874 do do

(D) do do No 8 of 3rd September 1874 do do

(E) do do No 9 of 10th December 1874 do do

(F) do do No 10 of 21st March 1875 do do

(G) The Bill No 1 of 1st May 1873 of measuring
the work executed by the Plaintiff

(H) do do No 2 of 28th May 1873 do do

(I) do do No 3 of 26th June 1873 do do

(J) do do No 4 of 21st August 1873 do do

(K) do do No 5 of 30th October 1873 do do

(L) do do No 6 of 13th November 1873 do do

(M) do do No 7 of 31st March 1874 do do

(N) do do No 8 of 1st September 1874 do do

(O) do do No 10 of 21st March 1875 do do

(P) The petition submitted to the Engineer
dated 9th April 1875 requesting to pay at least
moiety of the sum due to him to execute
the remaining work on the road.

(Q) The petition submitted to the Engineer
dated 2nd August 1875 requesting to pay
the sum due to him

(R) do to Defendant of 14th February 1876 for do

(S) do to District Engineer of 29th April 1876 for do

(T) An order to the Plaintiff of 16th March 1876
by the Engineer Chinnasamy Pillay to stop
all work except that of spreading stones.

(U) The Memo dated 21st December 1875
to the Plaintiff by the Defendant to
appear in person and settle his account
for the work he had executed on the road.

4 The exhibits produced by the Defendant
(I) The contract certificate dated 10th December
1874 measuring the work on the road upto 6th
December 1874 and the statement showing the
payment of the sum to the Plaintiff

(II) The statements containing contract
certificates, measurement accounts of 9th June 1875
measuring stones collected by the Plaintiff in the
3rd Division on the road.

(III) The statement showing the expenditure
of Rs 826-10-5 in that Division to execute the work
given by the Engineer Panasamudraiyar of
21st December 1876.

5 No witnesses were examined on the
side of the Plaintiff.

The verdict of the Defendant has
stated in his deposition that if the Court
were to decide that the Defendant

might receive the counter debt due to him according to Law he is ready to bring forth all evidence he could on his behalf and that in the event of the Court decreeing that the counter debt could not be paid by the Plaintiff judgment may be given with reference to the records of the case.

(6) May the Court decide the nature of the 5, 6, 7 accounts marked H. L. M. respectively, namely, if they are false or wrongly drawn up? and may the amount shown in them be set off against the sum claimed in the Plaint? These are the only two points which can be taken into consideration.

(7) The Plaintiff states that out of Rs 832 due to him for having conducted work on contract from 10th December 1874 to 16th March 1876 he has no desire for Rs 232 and that the balance Rs 600 should be paid to him.

(8) The defence put in by the Defendant is this. Rs 4500 had been paid to the Plaintiff on several occasions before the 10th December 1874 and Rs 551-1-4 the price of the work turned out by the Plaintiff after that date together with Rs 74-9-11 being the balance

left unpaid on the Plaintiff's last bill amounting in all to Rs 625-10-4 is still due to the Plaintiff. But deducting this latter sum from the amount drawn in excess by the Plaintiff (on bills Rs 5, 6, 7 which are either false or wrongly drawn up) the amount which should be paid by the Plaintiff to Defendant comes to Rs 756.

9 Accounts up to 10th December 1874 had been settled between the parties. If the Defendant was of opinion that the account was either false or wrongly prepared, the persons who drew up the accounts after examining and putting to rights the work executed on contract after that date and those who supervised such work together with the Plaintiff who has drawn certain excess amount should be sued for in a separate suit and it is not proper to say that such excess amount should be set off against the value of the work done after the above date. The Plaintiff is not the only person liable. Such Suit and Sections 121 & 175 of Act VIII of 1859 have no bearing on the present case. After all, this Suit is not

one claiming any debt (vide Decision given in No. 214 of 1864 reported in pages 296 of 2nd volume of High Court Report).


Under these circumstances I am of opinion that the setting off claimed by Defendant should not be enforced and consequently the two points above raised are decided in Plaintiff's favor.

10 As this suit is solely composed of the above issue (setting off) the merits or otherwise of the exhibits produced on both sides have not been spoken of.

It is therefore decreed that the Defendant do pay to the Plaintiff Rs 600 the amount of the suit together with the Plaintiff's cost.

The Defendant shall bear his own cost.

(Signed in Parsee)
 29th Sept 1877
 Syed Mahomed Musathapur Sahu
 Plaintiff
 Khueerfy
 W. Searingslow
 District Engineer.



2nd Dec 1877
 The Court of Session
 Madras
 In the case of
 Plaintiff vs Defendant
 1876 No. 399.

1. The Court of Session
 Madras
 In the case of
 Plaintiff vs Defendant
 1876 No. 399.

The Court of Session
 Madras
 In the case of
 Plaintiff vs Defendant
 1876 No. 399.

1st Dec 1877
 The Court of Session
 Madras
 In the case of
 Plaintiff vs Defendant
 1876 No. 399.

இரண்டாம் பகுதி 832ல் சீர்தயார்
 பனந்தி 232 பனந்தி 600ல்
 வந்திடுமென வந்திடுமென வந்திடுமென
 19 பனந்தி 232 பனந்தி 600ல்
 வந்திடுமென வந்திடுமென வந்திடுமென
 வந்திடுமென வந்திடுமென வந்திடுமென

Costa Rica = 4
Haiti = 1

Neukamm
Hogoonastah

3. δ എൻഡോസ്മോസിസ് -

A. 2098tham 19th 21st 22nd 23rd
1873 24th 25th 26th 27th 28th 29th
30th 31st 1st 2nd 3rd 4th 5th
B. 1873 6th 7th 8th 9th 10th 11th
12th 13th 14th 15th 16th 17th 18th 19th 20th 21st 22nd 23rd 24th 25th 26th 27th 28th 29th 30th 31st

Владимир
Хозомастов

9

876

94

162

28

and

15

1

92

93

1

22

7. 7

1

—

9.

7.

72

9/1



2



5

9

100

$\rho_k = 1$

4

3w.

2

25

77th Di. O'Connell, 29^a
O'Connell's O'Connell
O'Connell's O'Connell
O'Connell's O'Connell
O'Connell's O'Connell

(True copy)

Mrs. J. W. L. L.
 123 1/2 St. Louis
 E. W. L. L.

Verp. Gramm
Hrad goonestah.

Encls: 1 in a letter from the
 Dist. Engineer, to the Secy.
 to Govt P. M. D. No. ²⁶⁸ 40 da
 21st October 1877 -
 22nd Decem. 1877.

Dindigul Munsiff's Court dated 29 Sept.
In the presence of Syed Mahomed Musthafa
Munsiff.

No. 399 of 1876.

Contractor Sorkramania Pillay
Son of Arisa Pillay residing in
South Sea Street Madras } Plaintiff

Leath. C. V. Boddy W. A. Appl. } Dept.
Engineer, Deadwood Range

The Plaintiff claims Re. b. from the
Defendant for work executed on Road No. 5
leading to Chekanooray.

On hearing the pleadings and evidence adduced in this case by the Plaintiff's Agents Sivasubramania Pillay and Seshiah and on further hearing the arguments of the Defendant's Agents Messrs. Hickey and Hickey the Court decrees that the Defendant should pay the Plaintiff, the sum of Rs. 600 mentioned in the Plaint and his cost viz: Rs. 110 and that the former should bear his own cost.

Amount claimed Rs. 600-0-0
Particulars of cost to be paid to
the Plaintiff by the Defendant }
Takalat — Rs. 11-8-0

1876 @ 69 102.2
399
28 1/2 69 102.2



Leifur Eiriksson
for the project

Thompson, J. S.
London, N. Y.

Leahy 2003
Feb 26 11 41 AM '08

W. H. C. C.

Handwritten signature

Encls: 2 in a letter from
the Dist: Engineer, Madison
to the Secy: to Govt. P. M. D.
218, 2nd, December 1887 -
No: 180 dated 21st Oct 1887.

Sp: 2015.

Kundigul Division office
Tadamadura 10: October 1877

18

From

The Executive Engineer
Mudiyil Division

The District Engineer
Madurai

Encl. 4.
1 copy of letter
1 Judgment (copy)
1 Decree
1 Statement of costs.

Sci.

I have the honor to forward the accompanying copy of correspondence noted in the margin stating that judgment against Government has been passed in Original Suit No. 399 of 1876 in the file of the Windigul Munsiff's Court. The authenticated copy of the judgment and of the Decree that accompanied Messrs. Hickey & Hickey's letter No. 147 is also forwarded.

I request that you will let do good
as to inform me if an appeal should be put in,
and also if I should pay Messrs. Hickey & Hickey
the costs - Rs 25-8-6 - they claim.

Letter No 140 of 29-9-77
from Messrs Hickes &
Pickney

Letter A1586 of 29/1/77
from Maxine Hickey
Hickey

to 14796-1077
from Messrs
Wheeler & Gleason

1877
 1878
 1879
 1880
 1881
 1882
 1883
 1884
 1885
 1886
 1887
 1888
 1889
 1890
 1891
 1892
 1893
 1894
 1895
 1896
 1897
 1898
 1899
 1900

2.

[illegible]

Stamps paid 22.00
Dues 22.00

Keep ready for delivery, & let Dr.

Subscribed

Stonewall

7/14/74

I have to
Signed L. W. Pynter
Executive Engineer
Havildar Kumbhar

Enclosed

W. Harrington
District Engineer

Encls: 3 in a letter from the
 Dist. Engr: Madras to the
 Secy: to Govt. P.W. & S. 180
 72nd Decem. 1877
 dated 25th October 1877

Enclosure to Letter No. 20
 Statement of Receipts and Expenditure.
 In connection with Original Suit No. 377 of 1876.
 District District Munsiff's Court.
 Soabramania Pillay "Versas" The District Rang Officer.

1876 4 1877	C. S. No. 377 of 1876	Period Expenditure Rs. p. Rs. a. p.
Sept. 25	To Court Receipts on Tahalutnamah	8
" "	" " " " on written statement	8
Feb. 26	By Cheque on the Treasury	10
June 30	To Court Receipts on petition citing plaintiff as witness	8
July 3	" " " " on witness process, service fees	8
Oct. 12	" " " " on gazettes applying for authen- ticated copy of judgment & decree	1
" 2	" " " " on authenticated copy of judgment	8
" "	" " " " on " " " " of Decree	1
" 5	Copypist Fees for " " of judgment & decree	1 15 6
" "	Pleaders Fees as allowed by the court @ 5 per cent on Rs. 600	30
	Total Rupees	10 35 8 6
	Amount due to Messrs. Hickoy & Hickoy	25 8 6
	Grand Total Rupees	35 8 6 35 8 6

District }
 6th October 1877

/ signed Hickoy & Hickoy
 Pleaders.

/ True Copy

W. Harrington
 District Registrar,
 Madras

268 76th Anniversary 8/1-
No: 100 d/210th Lectr/77

Richard L. Evans

this date, I have the honor to state that
I do require a copy of the Judgment
and Decree in Original Suit No 399 of 1877,
and request that you will be so good
as to obtain and forward it to me.

I should also be obliged by your
informing me if you would recommend
us to appeal.

Yours faithfully,
J. H. Hickey
District Engineer
Public Works Department
Colonial Office
Singapore
1877

To the District Engineer
Public Works Department
Colonial Office
Singapore
Sir,

As requested in your letter of 11th 1877,
we have the honor of forwarding
an authenticated copy of the Judgment
and of the Decree in O. S. No 399 of 1876, and
beg to state that we are of opinion that
the Court should have allowed the Plea
of Set Off and not have denied the Plea
of a cross action. For the right of
"Set off" exists where there are cross de-
mands arising out of one and the
same transaction, or when they are so
connected by their nature and circum-
stances as to make it inequitable that
the Plaintiff should recover and the
Defendant be denied a cross suit. Also

in a suit to recover money due under
a contract it was held that the Defendants
were entitled to "set off" the amount of damages
they claimed that they had sustained by
reason of the Plaintiff's breach of the contract.
It would be well to try an appeal.

The Honourable Pleader had better be
consulted before taking any steps in
the matter. If you intend appealing you
will have to put in your appeal on or
before the end of this month.

We beg to enclose also a Statement
of Receipts and Expenditure in connection
with this suit. (O. S. No 399 of 1876) from
which you will perceive that a sum
of Rs 25-8-6 is due to us. An early
remittance of this sum will oblige.

Dindigul,
6th October 1877

J. H. Hickey
(Signed) Hickey & Hickey
Pleaders.

Yours very truly
J. H. Hickey
District Engineer

District Engineer

In the District Munsiff's Court
Dindigul In C. S. No: 399 of 1877.

Subramonia Pillay Contractor - Plaintiff

Assistant Engineer Dindigul Range } Defendant

To The Defendant

Whereas an application has been made by the Plaintiff to this Court for execution of decree passed in the case you are hereby requested to pay the said decree amount together with costs specified hereunder, to this Court or to show cause why the execution of decree should not be issued -

Amount decreed	600	-	-	-
Costs	110	-	-	-
Costs in execution	9	-	14	-
Notice Battah	4	-	8	-
Total	720	-	6	-

December 3
1877

Signature in Hindostani
Moostafa Saib.
District Munsiff

Recd: 5 in a letter from
the Dist. Engineer, Madras
to the Secy. to Govt. of M. S.
dated 21st Decr. 1877

/ True Copy /

W. Harrison

District Engineer,

Abia Lura.

94

Encl: 6. in a letter from the Dist.
Eng. Madras to the Secy to Govt.
No. 268 of 22.2.17.

The amount with costs of the decree passed
against this department, or show cause why
the execution of the decree should not be issued.
Kindly let me know soon what I am to do.

I have &c

(Signed) L. W. Paynter
Executive Engineer
Dindigul Division

(True Copy)

W. Hamilton
District Engineer
Madras

Copy of notice.

P. W. D.

Dindigul Division office
Camp Dindigul

18th December 1877

No 2823

From

The Executive officer

Dindigul D^o

To The District Engineer
Madurai District
Enclosure 1 Madurai

Sir

I have the honor in
continuation of my No. 2015
dated 10th October last
to forward for orders
the accompanying notice
from the District Council
of Dindigul, calling upon
me to either pay Rs 72069.

Encl: 7. in a letter from
the Dist Engr, Madras
to Sec. Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
No. 268 4/22 Dec 1877.

Copy of District R.O.
Letter.

No. 268

From.

W. S. Harrington Esq.
District Engineer, Madras.

To.

Colonel E. A. Foord R.E.
Secretary to Government D.P.W.
Madras.

Sir,

Enclosures: 7

1. judgment in the
No. 30 October

1. decree

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

1. copy of a letter from
the Dist. Engr. to the
Secy to Govt. D.P.W.
of 10 Oct 77.

With reference to your No. 3627 dated
as directed in G.O. No. 2792 dated 17 October 1876,
for the information and orders of Government.
But as I am desired to give the facts
of the case clearly I have the honor to report
as follows.
From Lieutenant Boddy's letter printed with
G.O. No. 2792 dated 17 October 1876 it appears
that a sum of Rs (756-9-5)
seven hundred and fifty six annas nine &
pice five was due by Contractor "Sobramania
Pillay" after a final measurement of the whole
of the work done by him. I venture to ex-
press an opinion that Lieutenant Boddy
should at once have proceeded against
him on these grounds, instead of which he

allowed the Contractor to take the initiative
and to bring the present suit which is for
the payment of a separate sum of Rs (600)
Six hundred being the value of certain
stones brought since a payment of Rs.
(4500-11-6) four thousand and five hundred
annas eleven & pice six was made; this
is admitted by the Defendant, and this being
so, I do not see that the Moonsiff could do
otherwise than he did viz: give judgment
in favor of the Plaintiff without paying
any heed to the counterclaim of the De-
fendant for Rs (756-9-5) seven hundred
and fifty six annas nine & pice five
which appears to have been improperly
brought forward at that particular time.
it should I imagine have formed altogether
a distinct claim and have been urged long
ago and prior to the institution of the
present suit. I am no lawyer and do not of
course presume to urge the matter from
a legal point of view; I merely state these
facts for the information of Government and
request to be permitted to pay into court
the sum stated by the Moonsiff to be
due viz: Rs (720-6-7) seven hundred and
twenty annas six & pice nine as per notice
received with Mr. Paymaster's 2523 of the

18. Instant also Rs (25-8-6) twenty five annas
eight & pice six being the amount claimed by
the Tahseel Sugaged. to conduct the suit for
the Defendant.

3. I beg your attention to the expression
of the Moonsiff's opinion that a fresh suit
should be filed against Contractor "Sobra-
manica Pillay" Mr. Overseer Williams who
overmeasured the work and prepared the
Bills and Mr. Hawksworth who paid the
Contractor the 25 per cent withheld by Lieut
Greer. It is not for me to decide whether
such a suit should or should not be filed,
but I fear that if instituted it might
not be successful both Mr. Hawksworth &
Mr. Williams having died since. "Mooroo-
gesa Moodely" the present Taluk Overseer of
Diudigul might however be cited as a
witness and perhaps a material one.

4. I may mention in conclusion
that "V. Subramania Dyer" the Government
Officer at Madurai whose opinion I asked
regarding the case hinted at "collusion" but
on whose part he would not state.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt servt

W. Harrington

District Engineer

From

The District Engineer

To, Madras

The Secretary to Govt

D. P. W.

Madras.

No. 268.

Dated 22nd December 1877.

Recd.

Recd. 7.

Contractor Subramia Pillay
reports regarding the sub
fled by the -

Go. 2792-17 Oct/76
CE memo 3627. of 30th
Oct/77 -

Cor - 28-12-77

No 3W

Public Works Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT. 29

UNDER date the 2nd January 1878
Read the following :-

Letter

From Eng^r Madras (H.E.) No 268 of 22nd Dec 1877.

The District Engineer
will pay into Court the sum
of Rs 720-6-9.

It is very plain that the
Counterclaim against the
plaintiff should have been
made before the present case
arose, and in its not being
made Mr Boddy showed want
of judgment.

LD

S. E. Madras. 7 ✓
S. E. Pictua. 6 ✓
L. P. H. A. 5 ✓
17

Sept 9-1-78

MDP

30

Alb.
manica May Hunt

30

100335

RECEIPT OF 1877
PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd. 4-1-78

To the R.B. Ma durt

Dated

For

Recd.

Encl.

G. O. 2 Jan 1878 No. 36.

Nos.

Unit sanctions in full
to the payment
into Court the sum of the
\$20.00 in connection with
the — brought against
Boddy & Co. by contract
William Riley of the
London St.

But in Reg.