

(1) Number of pages 20  
(2) Date of repair 10.8.87  
(3) Initials of the Referencer bva

# TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

P.W. DEPARTMENT

|          |           |        |
|----------|-----------|--------|
| G.O. No. | 215-W     | Press. |
| B.P. No. |           | Mis.   |
| Dated    | 27-1-1885 | 198    |

Not to be folded or roughly handled

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.  
Establishment.

READ—the following papers:—

From J. W. RUNDALL, Esq., Superintending Engineer, II Circle, to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, dated Nellore, 10th January 1885, No. 2382 K.S.

I have the honor, with reference to G.O. No. 2662 W., of the 29th October 1884, to request you will be good enough to let me know the date from which the increased rent is to be charged for the Collector's house at Masulipatam.

2. The repairs were completed in April last, and the house was occupied from the 1st May 1884 by the Acting Collector, Mr. W. P. Austin, who has left the district.

3. The present Collector, Mr. W. A. Happell, commenced occupation from June.

4. There is one circumstance in connection with the rent now fixed, which I think deserves consideration.

5. In my report on the estimate for repairs, sanctioned in G.O., No. 2265 W., of the 14th August 1883, I said that, in order to obtain the ordinary return required by Government on the original purchase-money and subsequent repairs, the rent would have to be raised, but I am informed that the building was not originally purchased on a valuation, but that the sum of Rs. 20,000 asked by the ex-Nawab of Masulipatam was sanctioned, more to help the Nawab who was in difficulties, than to acquire a property financially valuable. This appears to be the case from the order sanctioning the purchase (proceedings of Madras Government, Judicial Department, No. 1589,\* of the 8th August 1878), and from what I have seen of the building and its out-houses, when we dismantled it

the other day, I can hardly suppose that if valued, and bought at a fair valuation, as large a sum as Rs. 20,000 would have been offered. The roof of the main building was in very bad order, and the bulk of the walls consists of brick in mud.

6. The rent was, by the Government order sanctioning the purchase, fixed at Rs. 100 per month.

7. The actual sum spent on the sanction of Rs. 5,744 was Rs. 4,637. The total cost to Government has been Rs. 24,637. If the Government desire it, I will have a valuation statement prepared, upon which to base the rent, for, as already stated, I do not believe that intrinsically the house is worth the sum which it has cost.

From the same Officer, dated Commamur Canal, 16th January 1885, No. 314 C.

In continuation of my No. 2382, of the 10th instant, I have the honor to bring to your notice that the Collector of the Kistna claims that the increased rate of rent for his house should be charged only from the date on which the Government order fixing the rent at Rs. 150 per mensem was communicated to him.

2. This date the Collector states was the 1st December.

3. I think Mr. Happell's contention is a fair one, and is what would hold good in private transactions.

ORDER—dated 27th January 1885, No. 215 W., Public Works.

The rent of the Collector's residence at Masulipatam having been fixed at Rs. 150 per mensem in G.O., No. 2862 W., dated 29th October 1884, the Government see no reason to reopen the question. The enhanced rent will be charged from the date on which those orders reached the Collector.

(True Extract.)

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

To the Superintending Engineer, II Circle.  
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.  
" Revenue Department.

GENERAL  
ESTABLISHMENT.

Cost. of 1885 Madras  
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated January, 27th.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 27th Jan. 1885, No. 215 W.

JANUARY.

Rent

Orders declining to reopen the question of the rate of — fixed for the Collector's residence at Masulipatam.

N. 2382 N. 8

Superintending Engineer's Office,  
2nd Circle, Camp Bellona,  
10th January 1885.

From

The Superintending Engineer,  
2nd Circle.

S.

The Secretary to Government,  
Public Works Department,  
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor, with reference to G.O. N. 2662 W. of the 29th October 1884, to request you will be good enough to determine, the date from which the increased rent is to be charged for the Collector's House at Masulipatam.

2. The Repairs were completed in April last, and the house was occupied from the 1st May 1884, by the Acting Collector Mr. W. P. Austin who has left the District.

3. The present Collector Mr. W. A. Haffell commenced occupation from June.

4. There is one circumstance in connection with the rent now fixed, which I think

deserves consideration.

5. In my Report on the Estimates for Repairs sanctioned in G.O. No 2265 W. of the 14th August 1883, I said that, in order to obtain the ordinary return required by Government on the original purchase money and subsequent repairs, the rent would have to be raised, but I am informed, that the Building was not originally purchased on a valuation, but that the sum of Rs 20,000 asked by the Ex Nawab of Masulipatam was sanctioned, more to help the Nawab who was in difficulties, than to acquire a property financially valuable. This appears to be the case, from the order sanctioning the purchase P.M.J. Judicial Department, No 1589 of the 5th August 1878, and from what I have seen of the Building and its outhouses, when we dismantled it the other day, I can hardly suppose that if valued, and bought at a fair valuation, as large a sum as Rs 20,000 would have been offered. The roof of the Main Building was in very bad order, and the bulk of the walls consists of bricks

in mud.

6. The rent was, by the G.O. sanctioning the purchase, fixed at Rs 100 per month.

7. The actual sum spent on the sanction of Rs 5,744 was Rs 4,637. The total cost to Government has been Rs 24,637. If the Government desire it, I will have a valuation statement prepared, upon which to base the rent, for as already stated, I do not believe that intrinsically the house is worth the sum which it has cost.

I have the honor to be,  
Sir,

Your most Obedt Servant.

J. W. Randall  
Superintending Engineer,  
2nd Circle.

N<sup>o</sup> 333 Wd/21.8.78  
2265 Wd/14.8.83  
2662 Wd/29.10.84

From  
The Superintending Engineer  
2nd Circle



To The Secretary to Govt.  
P.W.D.  
Madras

Dated 10<sup>th</sup> January 1885

Despb 14<sup>th</sup> to

Recd

N<sup>o</sup> 2382

Masulipatam - Collector's House  
at - Requests to let him know the  
date from which the increased  
rent is to be charged for the - and  
states that under the circumstances  
now reported, the rent is high.

N<sup>o</sup> 314 C

Superintending Engineer's Office  
2nd Circle, Commamur Canal  
16<sup>th</sup> January 1885.

From

The Superintending Engineer  
2nd Circle.

L

The Secretary to Government  
Public Works Department  
Madras.

Sir,

In continuation of my N<sup>o</sup> 2382  
Che. 40 & sent of the 10<sup>th</sup> instant, I have the honor  
to bring to your notice, that the Collector  
of the Kistna claims, that the increased  
rate of rent for his house, should be  
charged only from the date on which the  
G.O. fixing the rent at Rs 150 per mensem,  
was communicated to him.

2. This date the Collector states was the 1<sup>st</sup>  
December.

3. I think Mr. Haffells' contention is a  
fair one, and is what would hold good in private  
transactions.

I have the honor to be,  
Sir,  
Your most obt. servant  
J. W. Randall  
Superintending Engineer 2nd Circle

The Supp. Engineer,  
2nd Circle

The Secretary to Govt  
P.W. Department  
Madras.

Dated: 16<sup>th</sup> January 1885.

P. 314-C

Masulipatam - Collector  
House at. Increased rate  
of rent for -

Brings to notice, that  
the Collector claims that  
the - should be charged  
from 1st Decemr 1884.

The Govt have  
apparently paid too  
much for this  
building and are  
recomping themselves  
by demanding from  
the occupants an  
excessive rent.

Under para 1227 of  
the S.W. Code, rent  
should be fixed  
with reference to  
the value of the  
property. If the  
rules ended here,  
there would be no  
difficulty in carrying  
out the proposals  
of the S.E. to revalue  
the property, and  
assess rent on the  
revised valuations.  
Reference to para  
1229 will, however,

shows that in fixing  
rent, the "actual  
or estimated Capital  
Cost of the property  
+ risk & maintenance  
have to be considered  
No estimate of  
Capital cost is  
needed in the present  
case; the actual  
cost being known.

In these circum-  
stances, it seems  
difficult, under the  
letter of the rules,  
to reduce the rent  
to a reasonable  
figure.

Perhaps the  
Judicial Dept. who  
are responsible for  
the purchase should  
be asked to decide  
the present question  
in the light of  
Public Works rules  
on the subject of  
rent. L.P. 17-1-85

C. 2. 10.

The rent having been  
definitely fixed by <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ in  
their order of 29<sup>th</sup> October, 84,  
I do not quite see why the question  
is reopened. No. 150 can't come  
about the recognized rental for a  
house letting what this did. The  
payment made may be in excess  
of actual value, but clearly from  
the description the cost of repairs  
will be abnormal. —

As to date, the enhanced rent etc?  
of course to be revised from date of notice.

Cd.

19.1.85



215. W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

To S.W.

C. No 538.

The draft C.O.,  
now with the Revenue  
Secretary, provides,  
I think, for the  
increased rent being  
charged from the  
date of the C.O.  
ordering the enhance-  
ment. This might  
perhaps be altered  
as proposed by the  
S.E.?

L.S.

22-1-83

C.O.W.

S.E. letter had better perhaps  
go in to Rev. Secy. C.O.  
22-1-83

To S.W.

I have seen the  
original draft which  
has now been returned by  
the Revenue Secretary.  
The proposed special  
alteration will satisfy

The Collector. It will  
not, I think, be  
necessary to send the  
draft back to the  
Revenue Secretary who,  
having approved of the  
principle of maintaining  
the enhanced rental  
can apparently have  
nothing to say to the  
change of date in  
favor of the Collector.  
The L. C. concurs.

R.S.  
26-1-85

Very good - the principle of  
immediate change taking effect from  
a date of receipt of order of their  
enactment, is, I believe, correct.  
The revision of draft should be  
put before W. for his initials.

CSJ  
26-1-85

To W. Submitted.

R.S.  
26-1-85

alteration in draft approved  
26-1-85

N<sup>o</sup> 215 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 27<sup>th</sup> January 1885.  
Read the following

From the Dy. Engineer  
II Circle  
To —

A. E. N<sup>o</sup> 2382 S.S. d/10<sup>th</sup> Jan/85  
( " " 314 C d/16<sup>th</sup> Jan 1885 )

The rent of the Collector's  
residence at Masulipatam  
having been fixed at Rs 150.  
per annum in G.O. 2662 W  
dated 29<sup>th</sup> October 1884, the  
Govt see no reason to reopen  
the question. The enhanced  
rent will be charged from  
the date <sup>on which</sup> those orders  
reached the Collector.

W.  
26-1-85

19-1-85

S. E. II Circle  
by P. W. Becker  
Rev. Dy. Engr.  
(The Rev. Secy for favor of C. C.)  
Desd. 3-2-85

RS

H.S.

W.  
20-1-85

400

Govt. of Madras.  
PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated

28-7-85

28-7-85

Recd.

Encl.

G.O. 27 Jan 1885, No. 215 W

Reut

Orders declining to  
reopen the question of  
increased rate of  
for the collectors' residence  
at Pudukkottai.

11

70

4.

18.45

28-7-85