155C. 14-5. 83
G.O. 2910W. 15. 10. 83
" 3684W. 22. 12. 83
" 517W. 25. 2. 84

No 1366 W a/12th June/85

Recorded

2. The Govt are glad to learn that no loss has accrued to the State from the overpayment referred to.

CW.
5.6.85

W.S.
7.6.85

13 W
12/6

S.E. VI C.
Exr. P.W.A. D.
12/6

Dy
15/6

O.S. 19/6.
C. 5.6.85 – 10.6.85

Dict. 4930
15

From (8)

The Supg Engineer
VI. Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Dated 28th May }
Despd 2d June } 1885
Recd

No 1366 W a/12th June

No 347 T.J.

Reports the recovery of the overpayment made to Contractor Mr Bulliard for timber supplied for Tanjore Jail

No. 347 T.J Supt Engrs Office 6th Circle

Kodaikanal 28: May/85.

Despd 2/6

From,

The Supg Engineer

6th Circle

To,

The Chief Engineer

P. W. D.

Sir,

Referring to para 6 of G.O. No. 3684 W dated 22nd December/83, I have the honor to report for the information of Government that the overpayment made to contractor, Mr. Bulliard for timber supplied for the Tanjore Jail has been recovered.

2. The overpayment, after thoroughly scrutinizing his accounts, was Rs 1452-12-8, and on giving him some more works, a sum of Rs 1202 has been recovered in the Tanjore Dn., and the balance Rs 250-12-8 has since been recovered in the Trichinopoly Division, where

he had some work in the Jail, and 10 per cent was deducted out of all bills, and the full amount due by him has been paid up to Government.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obdt. servt.

Lieut. Bo. E.
Supg. Engineer 6th Circle

831C - 20-4-83
955C - 14-5-4

and the Supdtg Engineer is still of opinion, in which the Government concur, that the Ex: Engr "ought to have seen "that the accounts were "properly maintained."

The Government do not see the necessity for at present taking up the collateral questions raised by the Supdtg Engr as to the forms and procedure of the Accounts Branch.

LM
20.2.84

No. 517 Way 25-2-84

LM
25/2

S E V Ucile

Despd 26/2/84.

R.S. LWC 20/2
Circ: 20/2/84 R 22/2/84 J.R.g 3/4 20/3 Entd in Recpt Regtr

No. 517 W. P. W. Department

Proceedings of the Madras Govt.

Under date the 25th February/84

Read the following:—

Letter from the S.E. VI Circle (A.E. No. 2205 T.J. df Feb: 5./84)

Endorsement thereon by the Exr. P.W. Acts. " 1179 df " 13 —)

After carefully considering the explanations which have now been submitted, the Government see no reason for withdrawing the censure conveyed ~~remarks made~~ in G.O. No. 3684 W df 22d December 1883.

The fact remains that a large quantity of timber was paid for, which had never been delivered;

No. 831 C - 20-4-83
955 C - 14-5-"
2910 W - 15-10-"
121 C - 17.1.84.

No. 293 D

Chepak
11th Febry/84

To C.

R. No. 1070.
11. 2. 84

Enc: 2

For any remarks he may wish to offer

No. 831 C df 20.4.83.
" 955 C df 14.5.83.
" 2919 W df 15.10.83
" 3684 W df 22.12.83
" 121 C df 17.1.84.

9-2-84
D.W.

9.2.84
W.

No. 1179 df 13th Feby/84

Enc: 2.

To W.

Your Office Note No. 293 D. dated 11th. February 1884.

The papers in this case submitted with your Office Note No. 2657 D. dated 13th. December 1883 were not copied to complete my file, but as far as I remember the complaint against this Office was, that it had not detected that the Sub Divisional Officer had not inspected Materials, the Bills for which had been paid. In the present letter from the Executive Engineer it is stated towards the end of his para 3, that 7½ tons of logs were paid for, which were never delivered, and the subject of the whole correspondence is described in the

Circ: 20/2/84

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

From

The Superintending Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
Prod

No. 2205 T.J.

Dated 5
Received } February 1884.

Enclosure

Tanjore District Jail.

Reports further upon the overpayment made to Mr. Brilliard for timber supplied to the —

Superintending Engineer's letter (now sent me) as "the overpayment to Mr. Bulliard in the Tanjore Division.

2. ~~In~~ The very lengthy criticisms which the Superintending Engineer and Executive Engineer offer for the consideration of the Chief Engineer regarding the utter ~~inability~~ inutility of the Accounts Department leave the main point of the subject wholly untouched. Mr. Hughes points out (para 5) that "it simply depends on the honesty of the Executive Engineer and his Subordinates whether Government get value for the money expended. The Examiner can in no case exercise any control until it is too late to be of any use". This surely clears the Accounts Department from all responsibility for any payment for value not received, be that value the result of work done by Contract, or by any other Agency whatever. No amount of scrutiny of vouchers for payments made for work said to have been done would enable the Accounts Office to check the work done for which payment was made- nor is it intended that it should do so.

3. If you desire that I should take up the general questions (which have no bearing on the case in point) I shall be very glad to do so, but I would first ask you to read the Superintending Engineer's para 2 and then his para 8 and to say thereafter whether it is necessary.

DCE

C.

C.P.
13/2

Contract & departmental, are all in proper form and order, at present an Examiners examination of an office is far too much a formal examination of a set of books that can be and are kept up to his satisfaction when the office is far from being what it ought to be.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant.

W R [illegible] 2 Dec 1886

Supg. Engineer, Circle.

3496 L
4-1-84

From P.W. Enl 452/84 1388

The Executive Engineer
Tanjore Division

To

The Supg Engineer
6th Circle

Dated 28th January
Despd 1st } February 1884
Recd 3

No. 197.

Tanjore New Jail.

Reporting the circumstances under which the payments made to Mr Bulliard for timber supplied by him has been treated as for work done by Departmental Agency-

---

No 2205 T.J.

Supdg Engineer's office, Circle,
Trichinopoly 5th February 1884

From
The Superintending Engineer
6th circle.

To,
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

E. Engr's letter No 197 dated 28.1.84 (to be obligingly retd)

Sir,

I have the honor to forward in original a^x letter from Mr Hughes Executive Engineer regarding the overpayment to Mr Bulliard in the Tanjore Division which was dealt with in G.O No 3684 W of 22d December I regret with regard to paras 3 & 7, I am still of the same opinion as expressed in my report No 1731 dated 29th November that "Mr Hughes ought to have seen that the accounts were properly maintained" and therefore I must leave to you the disposal of his request that the censure passed on him by Govt may be withdrawn.

2. I have to call your attention to a point on which I request most serious attention. In para 4 of the G.O in question it is said that the "Examiner explains that his office is in no "way responsible for the overpayment inas" "much as the bills in question were not" "submitted to him and that the payments" "were evidently treated as for work done" "by departmental agency."

I called on Mr Hughes to explain this as it seemed to me utterly against all orders that large sums should be paid to a Contractor on a Contract for wrought teakwood and that no voucher whatever should be sent for payments made to the Examiner.

3. From Mr. Hughes letter it appears that in an audit note for December 1881 the Examiner directed that bills for materials prepared on form 18 (new number in Code M 17) should be included "under Daily Labour and no vouchers need accompany the accounts". That the payments to Mr. Bulliard were acknowledged in this form M 17 and therefore the vouchers were not sent to the Examiner.

4. The Examiner does not take any notice of the fact that form M 14 ought properly to have been used but is content to show that his office in Madras is no way responsible and takes no action on the irregularity committed and passed by his Accountant in Tanjore.

5. I further submit that the mere use of form M. 17 is not sufficient reason for no voucher for payment being sent to the Examiner's office and that as he is supposed to have filed in his office vouchers for all payments except petty ones, he ought to have seen when inspecting the Tanjore office that receipts were taken on proper forms and submitted to him.

6. I fully agree with Mr. Hughes remarks as to the absurdity of the present system which in this case has so utterly failed and the Account Department instead of being a help and assistance to the Executive Engineer as he had a right to expect has proved itself a broken reed.

7. I see no reason why departmental work should be treated so differently from Contract work in the Examiners office and if it is unnecessary for him to have vouchers for the one I cannot understand the necessity or advantage in his having them for the other.

8 Sending down for record in the Examiner's office all receipts &c adds enormously to the work in the offices and necessitates duplicates being taken. I consider, it would be much better if this was not done in future but that they should be filed and recorded in the Executive Engineer's office, the Examiner being instructed when inspecting offices to go over them and see that they and all other accounts

Contract & departmental, are all in proper form and order, at present an Examiners examination of an office is far too much a formal examination of a set of books that can be and are kept up to his satisfaction when the office is far from being what it ought to be.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant.

2 Dec 1886
Supd. Engineer, Circle.

---

passed upon me.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most Obt. Servt.
W. Hughes.
Executive Engineer

and only half the work done. As in the former cases it simply depends on the honesty of the Executive Engineer and his Subordinates whether Government get value for the money expended. The Examiner can in no case exercise any control until it is too late to be of any use. Where work is done wholly on contract the scrutiny of the vouchers is minute and thorough, and there is every guarantee that the sums represented as paid have been actually disbursed to the signers of the receipts and in the case of works over Rs 500 in value any deviation from the Estimate has to be explained eventually. The multitude of small works are made little account of.

6. It appears to me that if the Examiner's check is necessary in the case of Contract works it is still more necessary in the case of works carried out departmentally.

7. Should there be anything in the above not previously reported regarding my connexion with the overpayment to Mr. Balliard or should the matter be shewn in a light which may induce you and the Chief Engineer to take a view more favorable to me than that already presented to Government, I trust I may not be considered troublesome in requesting that Government may be asked to cancel the censure passed

the amounts of the different sub heads of the Estimate and the work done on each, but until the quantity or the Estimated Value of a sub head is exceeded he has no ground for objection. The rate may vary widely from that estimated: in excess owing to more materials than used having been charged off; or in defect owing to outstanding balances. Excess over sub heads may not usually occur until a work is near completion and then the explanations required merely anticipate what have to be given in the Completion Report. In the Completion Report minor deviations are explained. (What the Executive Engineer considers important deviations being supposed to be reported when they occur.) and a Certificate that the work has been carried out is signed by the Executive Engineer. When a work is estimated at Rs 2500 or under the Examiner has not even the detailed work Voucher and has to wait for the Completion Report in which the sub heads are given and the names of the Officers and Subordinates in charge, but there is nothing to shew whether ~~the work~~ the work has ever been inspected by a responsible officer. In the case of works under Rs 500 the Completion Report shews merely total of Estimate and Expenditure, names of those in charge and date of inspection but for anything the Examiner knows double rates may have been paid

Considered reliable and sufficiently experienced.

4. It has been found a fault that I did not have copies of measurements submitted to me with bills paid in the Sub Division Office and if the Sub Division Officer be irresponsible for errors, I have been certainly to blame, but looking on him as in great degree responsible I did not see the necessity of largely adding to his already heavy Office work by compelling him to have a great number of pages of measurements copied out every fortnight — There must be retained in the Sub Division Office a copy of the measurements on which bills are made, for reference in preparing subsequent bills —

5. I venture to point out that if Government intended that the Examiner should exercise control over expenditure on all kinds of works the system of accounting must be imperfect since practically no check at all is exercised by him in the case of works carried out departmentally and in some Divisions nearly all the work is done in this manner. For instance, in the case of a large bridge or building the course followed would usually be to prepare the materials departmentally or have them supplied by contractors, and the building would be done departmentally. Not a single receipt for money paid need be sent to the Examiner from beginning to end of the work. He would receive monthly a work voucher shewing the

would be sufficiently guarded if those who make and pay erroneous bills be held responsible and if only reasonable supervision be expected from Officers who may have subsequently to examine the bills — I may notice that the duties of Sub Division Officers have, in most Divisions at least, become a good deal different from what is prescribed in the Code, the system laid down in which can only be partly worked in large Divisions. Instead of being merely Assistants to the Executive Engineer in the preparation of estimates and execution of works and having nothing to do with payments except for labor and for such sundry work as can be paid for from an Imprest, Sub Division Officers generally have a drawing account at the Treasuries and are allowed to pay for Contract and all other kinds of work in their Sub Divisions. It has been recognized that extra Office work is thus thrown upon them and a Second Clerk (called temporary but his continued employment is unavoidable under the present system) has been allowed them — The inconvenience and possible mistakes that might arise from having an unnecessarily large number of disbursers are so obvious that I rarely make any payments except for Establishments and for works in the Head Quarters Sub Division; This is, I suppose, the same in other Divisions where the Sub Division Officers are

Considered —

The Value of 7½ tons of logs which I estimate to be the quantity paid for by the Sub Division Officer and never delivered - Vide my No 3312/10.11.83 para 2 - is Rs 1012 and there was a deduction of Rs 611 from the previous bills - But little exception can be taken ——— to my not having insisted on lower rates being paid: my failure to detect that an insufficient sum was recovered when the Contractor delivered some completed work is surely a pardonable oversight which anyone might have committed: the payment by the Sub Division Officer for a large quantity of timber of the delivery of which he had no assurance, and his payment of the sum held as security without permission and without the Contract having been fulfilled or even the Contract time having elapsed were occurrences which I could not possibly foresee and prevent -

3. I do not know what view you have taken when reporting to Government regarding the overpayment to Mr. Bulliard or whether you have forwarded my reports but I cannot but feel that I have been very severely dealt with in incurring so heavy a penalty as the Censure of Government - There are generally over 200 works in hand in the Division and if I am to be held personally responsible for every error in payment I must devote most of my time to scrutinizing the accounts. It appears to me that the interests of Government

on Form No 18 - Such bills on Contract form as were sent with my previous report are for other works - The Accountant brought probably all these bills to my notice as they were received from the Sub Division Office - Though the rate paid for some of the timber was too high it was unnecessary to order the Sub Division Officer to make a recovery on the ground of more than the market value being paid, as the timber in question was being rapidly converted into scantlings and the deductions from the bills being considerable, there seemed ample security that any payment in excess would be soon recovered - As I mentioned in a former report the Contract bond had been forwarded to the Sub Division Office as soon as approved by you and the Chief Engineer, and there was nothing in the Division Office to remind me or the Accountant that the Contractor should get only 80 percent of the value as an advance on incomplete work - There was one error which escaped my notice and which the accountant could not be expected to recognize as an error viz the recovery when the Contractor delivered 15 tons of scantling of only the advance given on 15 tons of logs. The waste in preparing the scantlings had not been allowed for and there was consequently a clear overpayment on that item of Rs 500 or Rs 600 - With all that there was still sufficient security against loss to Government until the payments unfortunately made in July - The

No. 197.

Tanjore Division Office
Camp Upper anicut 28th January 1884.
Despd 1st Feby/84.

From,

The Executive Engineer
Tanjore Division

To,

The Superintending Engineer
6th Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

I have the honor to report, with reference to your Endorsement No $\frac{2025 Tj}{8.1.84}$, that it was at one time customary to send bills for materials to the Examiner with the monthly accounts but the practice has been discontinued since receipt of the Audit note on my accounts for December 1881. In this Audit note, Item 10, the Examiner directs that "Supplies of materials, claims for payments which are prepared on form No 18 "Bill for materials" need not be included as Contract or Petty Contract, but under Daily Labor, and no Vouchers for payments need accompany the accounts. As regards payments on account of Contract or Petty Contract every Voucher must be submitted, no matter how small the amount might be."

I had forgotten the Examiner's orders and have been under the impression that bills for materials were being sent to him.

2. Mr. Bulliard's Contract being only for materials his bills were correctly prepared on

---

No 2910 W.A. of 15th Oct/83

A further report will be awaited.

W 5.10.83.

7C

B.No 3/84 of 22.12.83

Seen 10/10

The Superintending Engineer
Sixth Circle

Wtg 3/10 6.10. Cd 5/10 R 8/10

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 1296 T.J.

Dated 28th } Sept / 1883
Received 3/10/83

Enclosure —

Overpayment made
to Mr Bulliard. a
Contractor for teak
-wood for the Tanjor
Jail. — Reports re-
-garding —

No 2910 W.A. of 15-10-8

write order

Entd in Recpt. Regr.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Camp Kodaikanal 28th September 1883.

No. 1296 T.J

From
The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras.

ENCLOSURE.

Sir,

I regret to have to report that the Executive Engineer Tanjore brings to notice that there has been a serious Overpayment made to Mr Bulliard a Contractor for teakwood for the Tanjore Jail work as far as I can understand it is about Rs 2800 that has been paid without security. The payments were made by Mr Bird Assistant Engineer and I have called on him for an Explanatio

2. I Consider that the Executive Engineer should have known the facts & irregularities before he did and most Certainly that he should have reported the matter at least 2½ Months ago.

As

As soon as I get full information I will report the matter in full detail.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most Obedient Servant
W M Hume Lieutt Col R.E
Superintending Engineer 6th Circle

No 955 C d/ 14th May/83

The tender presented by Mr Bulliard of Pondicherry for the supply of teak-wood required for the Tanjore Jail Work is approved

2. The work should be pushed on with all expedition

CJ
14/5

Book of plans sent by Railway. Plan No 1 "Compound wall" has been retained in the P.W. Secretariat & will follow shortly

No 831 C d/ 20-4-83

7 C
P No 2910 ~ 15.10.83

To S.E. Sixth Circle, with all enclos: of his letters No 327 J & 243 T.J.

KWW
15/5

Sd 18/5

P.W.C. No 3780

From,

The Supt Engineer
6th Circle

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No 243 T.J

Dated 1st May/83.

Recd 4/5/83

Enclo: 4.

(*) Book of plans not received

Tanjore Jail.

Forwards the sanctioned plans & Estimates for the —

No 955 C d/ 14-5-83

W. H. Brodie

Entd in Receipt Regr.

No. 243 T.J. Superintending Engr's Office 6 C.
Trichinopoly — May 1883

From

The Superintending Engineer
6th Circle

To

The Chief Engineer
Public Works Department
Madras.

Enclo: 3 + 1/4 =
1. Estimate (detailed)
1. abstract estimate
1. Book of plans (sent by Rail)
1. R. Receipt.

Sir,

With reference to your memo No. 831 C of 20th April 1883, I have the honor to forward the Book of Plans and Estimates for the Tanjore Jail sanctioned in G. O. No. 3059 W. of 20th November 1882.

I have the honor &c
Sir
Your most Obedt Servt

Lieut Col R.E.

Superintending Engineer
6th Circle

No. 831 Cd/20-4-83

7 C
955 C 14.5.83

Entered in Receipt Reg

P.W.D.

No. 831. C.

Memorandum

Letter from the Sup. Eng. Sixth Circle No. 32. T. J. dated 7th April/83.

With refce. to letter from the Sup. Engr. Sixth Circle No. 32. T. J. dated 7th April 1883, the undersigned has the honor to request that the plans and estimates for the Tanjore Jail sanctioned in G.O. No. 3059 W dated 20th Novr./82 may be forwarded to this Office for reference.

/By order/

Chepauk
20th April/83

/Sd/ C Bowen Major R.E.
Dy. Chief Engr. P.W.D.

To The Superintending ~~Engineer~~
Sixth Circle —

✓ Des 21/4

[illegible] 19-3-74 [illegible] 600 d/ 18-3-7
G.O. 3059 W d/ 20-11-82
" 2755 W d/ 23-10-82
" 862 W d/ 31-3-82
" 2221 d/ 7-9-81
" 847 W d/ 29-3-81
" 1843 d/ 20-7-76
No. 831 C d/ 20th April/83

S.E. [illegible]
(with [illegible])

W.C. No. 3/[illegible]

From,
The Supt. Engineer
6th Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

No. 32 T.J.
Dated 7th April/83.
Recd. 11/4/83

Enclo: 4

~~No. 831 C d/ 20-4-83~~

agreement drawn out by Mr. Bulliard for the supply of Teak-wood required for the Tanjore Jail work.

Forwards for approval &c.—

with [illegible]

D.W.
W

No. 1032.-

Executive Engineer's Office
Tanjore 4th April 1883

From,

The Executive Engineer
Tanjore Division

To,

The Superintending Engineer
6th Circle.

Reference your No. 2075 T J / 19-2-83.

Sir,

Enclo-3
1 Bond
2 Estimate
3 Tender
3

I have the honor to forward herewith for the approval of the Chief Engineer a Contract agreement from Mr Bulliard of Pondicherry for the supply of 3011 Cft of teakwood Scantlings required for the District Jail Tanjore. As Mr Bulliard was not here except on one occasion when I was in Camp, I was unable to get the agreement made out before.-

I have &c &c

(Signed) W. Hughes
Executive Engineer
Tanjore Division

(True copy)

Lieutt Col R.E.
Supg Engineer 6th Circle.

No 32 T.J.

Supg Engineer's Office 6th Circle
Camp, Vimdil 7th April 1883

From,
The Superintending Engineer
6th Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Enclos. 2.
1. agreement &
1. copy of letter.

Sir,

I have the honor to forward for your approval a tender presented by Mr Bulliard of Pondicherry for the supply of Teakwood required for the Tanjore Jail work.

2. The agreement drawn out by Mr Bulliard, and a copy of the Executive Engineer's letter* explaining the circumstances under which he was selected are herewith forwarded for information and obliging return.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant
Lieutt Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer 6th Circ

* No 1032 / 4.4.83.

G.O. – 97 d/ 19-5-74 G.O. 160 d/ 18-3-74
G.O. 3059 W d/ 20-11-82
" 2755 W d/ 23-10-82
" 862 W d/ 31-3-82
" 2221 d/ 7-9-81
" 847 W d/ 29-3-81
" 1843 d/ 20-7-76
No 831 C d/ 25th April 83

P. W. C. No 31

From,
The Supt Engineer
6: Circle

To,
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No: 32 T.J
Dated 9: April 83.
Recd 11/4/83

Enclos: 4

No 783 W C d/ 2-11-82

agreement drawn out by Mr Bulliard for the supply of Teak-wood required for the Tanjore Jail work.

Forwards for approval an –

S. E. [illegible] with 2 encls [illegible]

with memo

D.W. / W

C. No 1388

The S.E. himself says that he cannot relieve the Ex: Engr: from responsibility inasmuch as he "ought to have seen that the Accounts were properly maintained".

Form No M 17 seems suitable enough. The Subdivisional officer certifies that the claim "is correct" and that "the materials have been received by me". But when large payments, as in the present case, are made, the Examiner should, I think, have the voucher before him. If the Examiner has issued such instructions as those referred to by the S.E in para 3 of his letter, the matter seems to require looking into.

L.S.

15-2-84.

W.

Jaunpur Dt. Jail Ex. Acc. 20/2

Overpayment for timber supplied to the —

There is nothing adduced to warrant, as far as I can see, re-consideration of the case & withdrawal of the censure.— The accounts &c. referred to have little to say to the matter, & the fact remains that a large quantity of timber was never delivered & was paid for.

To me it seems needless to go further into the orders of Examiner referred to.

No doubt the work thrown on the Estabmt in the charge of Accounts is very heavy. The circular now going round to elicit the opinions of officers as to the remedy may possibly lead to some simplification, but the few replies I have seen don't promise much & the subject is a difficult one to treat. It will be dealt with "in extenso" by & bye. —

CJ.
15-2-84

I do not see how it is possible to relieve Mr. Hughes from the share of censure which has fallen on him. The order must I think be in the sense of the above remarks.

Rec: such as those dated 22-12-83, No. 3684 W,

Should I think be printed
It is very inconvenient
to have the papers connected
with a case of this nature
kept in MS.

M.

18·2·84

F.

~~[illegible]~~

What is the rate in the Estimate for Teakwood wrought framed & fixed?

The extra allowance for length of "joists" as shewn in tender must mean for length of joints..

C.S.
18/4.

What is the allotment of year?

D.W.

Both plans and estimate were returned after examination and sanction by the Supt. Engr. 6th Circle so should you wish it reference will be made to him to answer the first two questions.

This year's allotment is Rs 80,000 — —

B.H.

18/4/83

Please ask.

C.S.
19/4.

Public Works Department, 188 3-84.

Current No. 3157

Letter No. 32 T. J.

Dated the 7/4/83

From the Suptg. Engr. 6th Circle

Note of Remarks.

1. This is a contract agreement drawn out by Mr. Bulliard of Pondicherry for the supply of 3011. Cft of teak wood scantlings for Rs. 11,290, required for the District Jail Tanjore.

2. A copy of the Ex. Engr's letter No 1032 d/ 4-4-83 explaining the circumstances under which he was selected is also enclosed.

17/4/83

JBH

D.W.

The plans and estimates of Tanjore Jail have been received.

The rate per 1 c. ft. of teak is Rs. 3-8-„-but it is to be noted the words 'wrought and framed' and 'fixed' have not been inserted in the estimates.

The word 'joists' has been used for 'joints'

The allotment for this year is Rs 80,000-„-„

JBH

12/5/83

Sanction + communicate same sharp & that work may go on. Ce