1/465 Cl/87 2235 [illegible]

COURT FEE
TWO ANNAS
INDIA TWO ANNAS
FOR COPIES

In the Court of Session Godavary at Rajahmundry

From what Court the appeal is preferred } Joint Magistrate Godavery

No. of the Case in the Court 1 of 1887.

No. of the appeal ——— 3 of 1887.

Name and description of the Appellant } Citturi Ramamurty Surki Gumasta D P W Dowleswaram.

Sentence and law under which it was imposed in the Lower Court ——— } To pay a fine of Rs100 and in default to suffer four months simple imprisonment Section 500 I. P. C.

Whether confirmed, modified or reversed } Reversed.

Date					
Of presentation	Of filing	Of notice issued by Court to appear	On which appellant ordered to appear	Of Hearing	Of Order.
21-3-87	23-3-87	23-3-87	30-3-87 8-7-87	30-3-87 8-7-87	11-7-87

Judgment.

The appellant a gumasta in the D P W Department on Rs12 a month has been convicted for defaming the first witness Rangarow a D. P. W. accountant on Rs 121 a month.

2 The appellant who does not know English signed two fac-simile petitions written in that language and despatched one to the Executive Engineer Eastern Division Godavary District and the other to the Examiner of Public Works accounts charging the accountant Rangarow—

1st Sheet P.R.

150 GA

[illegible] 2/12/0 [illegible]

STAMP DEPARTMENT
MAY 4
1887
GODAVERY

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 25 [illegible] /1887 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

E.R
P.W 6974/87
3457/88

INDIA
TWO ANNAS
دو (٢) آنہ
FOR COPIES

in collusion with the Anicut Superintendent with neglecting to credit for upwards of a year a sum of Rs 7-8 ans due by Rangarow himself and Rs As 27-6 due by another person for auction purchases and for (~~dirting~~) JR diverting from the new house of the Superintending Engineer then under construction to a private residence the accountant was building a couple of stone balls worth 8 annas and a certain quantity of ground chunnam and some teak wood big logs.

3 With regard to the logs the petition distinctly stated "It cannot be proved now" and with regard to the chunnam "It is doubtful to prove but brought to the notice of Master."

4 It is practically impossible for the appellant when made a defendant on a charge of defamation to adduce conclusive proof of the irregularities charged against the accountant which he clearly stated were difficult or impossible of proof but he has brought quite sufficient evidence

156 E.A

2nd Sheet JR

STAMP DEPARTMENT
MAY 4
1887
GODAVERY

2121 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 25 [illegible] 1887 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

E. 16/15
~~PW 697~~
245 - 7/88

TWO ANNAS
INDIA
TWO ANNAS
FOR COPIES

to show that he was amply justified in bringing these matters "to the notice of Master" (II) the Executive Engineer who has lawful authority over the accountant with respect to the subject matter of accusation.

5. The appellant says that he was 20 days getting his petition written after he commenced to supply the materials for it; it was only on the 11th September some fourteen months after the auction that the accountant paid As 7 - as 8 which he did not credit to Government until the appellant began to move in the matter the other item Rs 27 - As 6 is still not collected from Bhashika charlu Iyengar who was Lunka Agent for Messrs Arbuthnot and Co.

6. Further the Petition stated that the accountant and the Anicut Superintendent were intentionally deceiving Government in several ways which could only be proved on enquiry and in support of this allegation the appellant was allowed by this Court

156 G.A

3rd Sheet

to

[illegible] 2/122 [illegible]

STAMP DEPARTMENT
MAY 4
1887
GODAVERY

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 25 [illegible] 1887 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

E.~~14~~ 15

P.W ~~6974~~/87
3457/88

INDIA
TWO ANNAS
FOR COPIES

THOS. DE LA RUE & CO. LONDON

to adduce evidence which the Joint Magistrate at the trial at first refused to admit.

7 The appellant brings evidence to prove that 9700 bricks worth Rs 2 - As 6 - a thousand were diverted to the accountant's house from that of the Superintending Engineer.

8 The contractor (2 W) sent Rs 9700 according to indent for the Superintending Engineer's house on 5th August, but when he presented his bill to the Anicut Superintendent, he was told that these bricks had been sent to the house of the accountant who would pay for them privately he has however not yet been paid for them.

9 A Atheyya (3 W) is one of the bandy men who carted the bricks from the Superintending Engineer's house to the accountant's house. K. Bulli Brahmadu (4 W) a carpenter who worked at the accountant's house says that bricks for the terrace were brought from the Superintending Engineer's quarters.

10 V Gantayya (5 W) one of the contractors for the

150 E.A

4th Sheet

STAMP DEPARTMENT
MAY 4
1887
GODAVERY

12123 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 25 [illegible] 1887 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

E. ~~13~~ 14
P.W. ~~6976~~
345-7/89
/88

TWO ANNAS
INDIA TWO ANNAS
FOR COPIES

Superintending Engineer's house heard the Anicut Superintendent give the order and saw the bricks carted away for the accountant's house.

11 T. Veeranna (6 W) a carpenter who worked at the accountants house was sent by him to ask the anicut Superintendent for square bricks and he built the accountant's terrace with square bricks brought from the Superintending Engineer's house.

12 T. Venkatareddy (7 W) and I Venkataswamy (8 W) carpenters who were working at the Superintending Engineer's quarters saw the anicut Superintendent send the bricks off to the accountant's house.

13 It is urged against the appellant that evidence of this kind is easily (~~favourable~~ procurable ??) & not entitled to much consideration, but it is difficult to see what other evidence could possibly (~~no~~ be ??) adduced than that of the contractor who supplied the bricks on indent for the Superintending Engineer's house & has not yet been paid for them the

156 G.A

5th Sheet

C.R. 2124 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 25 [illegible] /887 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

STAMP DEPARTMENT
MAY 4
1887
GODAVERY

E. ~~12~~ 13

P.W. ~~6976/87~~

2457/88

INDIA
TWO ANNAS
FOR COPIES

workmen there and the contractor who saw the bricks despatched, a bandy man who took them and the workmen who received them and used them for the accountant's terrace.

14 The documents produced from the D P W office tend to support the appellant's contention Exhibit I, the counterfoil of the boat note originally showed 9700 bricks despatched and this is supported by the time-table Exhibit 2, and by the register (Exhibit 3) kept by the Lock Superintendent at Dowleswaram 9700 bricks were despatched on 5th August and passed through the lock on the 6th.

15. The figure 9700 has been erased & 1000 written in red ink over it, and what purports to be the foil is produced with "1000" clean written in it without any alteration; but this foil is of broader paper and the margin pattern in no way corresponds with that of the counterfoil running up to the top of the paper in the foil & with the usual margin in the counterfoil it is absolutely certain

150 E.A

6th Sheet

1212 5 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 25 [illegible] /887 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

STAMP DEPARTMENT
MAY 4
1887
GODAVERY

Ex 12
P.W. ~~6/97~~ 6/8
345/88

INDIAN TWO ANNAS
TWO ANNAS
FOR COPIES

that the Counterfoil (Exhibit 1) and the foil (Exhibit 1 a) have never been united so far as appears from the evidence in this case, and the writer of the boat note was not examined by the Joint Magistrate although he was summoned, the foil & counterfoil produced are suggestive of the original foil having been destroyed and a fresh one written while the counterfoil which could not be removed easily from a stitched book, has been altered to correspond with the false foil.

16 Taking the petition written by the appellant as a whole, I am of opinion that it does not show a malicious intention but that ~~the~~ he preferred in good faith and on not unsubstantial grounds, an accusation against the accountant to the Head of his office who had lawful authority over him with respect to the subject matter of the accusation.

17 In ~~and of~~ my opinion the conviction is not

150 GA

7th Sheet

STAMP DEPARTMENT
MAY 4
1887
GODAVERY

[illegible] 2/12 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 25 [illegible] 1887 [illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Ext.
~~Pll. 67/76~~
345/88

INDIA
TWO ANNAS
FOR COPIES

sustainable: the finding and sentence are reversed and the fine, if levied will be returned to the appellant. 17th July 1887.

(Signed), A L Lister
Sessions Judge

(True Copy)

Exdly
RAl
Exd
29-7-87

Ramasawmy
Supn

Application made 23-7-1887
Stamps called for 25-7-1887
Stamps deposited 26-7-1887
Copy ready 29-7-1887
Do. Delivered 4-8-1887

SUPERINTENDENT.

27 EA

STAMP DEPARTMENT
MAY 4
1887
GODAVERY

Rs 2127 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 25 [illegible] 1887 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

E4

~~No. 1971~~
345
/88

at Dowlai

varam

Quantity

1886
August

August

Subordi

F/ for the Month of August /85 No 39 Canal iron Punt Tyndal Tadavatta Venkadu.

Dates	At Loading place				At unloading place		Signatures
	Name of place and time of arrival	Time of despatch	Description and quantity of material	Name of work	Name of place and time of arrival	Time of Despatch	
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							
29							
30							
31							
August /85							
1		6 P. M.	9700 Terrace bricks 3000 Flat tiles 2850 Pan tiles	Constructing Supg Engrs quarters	9 A. M.	5 P. M	(Sd) N. Coopuswamy (Do) B. Venkataringaswamy
2							
3							
4							
5							
7	7 A M	6 P. M	Terrace bricks	Do — do —	10 A. M.	7 A. M	(Sd) N. Coopuswamy — (Sd) V. Venkatadry
8							
9							
10			and so on —				

Muster Roll

Names	Rate
Tyndal Tadavatla Venkadu	
Lascar Do Narigadu	
Lascar Sady Lalboda	

(26)
Employed in Conveying
Terrace bricks from
Vemagiri brick pits
to Supg Engr's Quarters
Days
6

Aud 10 Sn

345

G. T. Dale Esquire
Superintending Engineer
First Circle

The humble representation from Contractor
Vistimahanty Ghantirala of Dowlaishwaram

Most Honored Sir,

I most humbly beg to bring to your honor's notice that on the 6th of August /86, I presented a petition to your honor, begging to issue orders to the ancient Supdt. so that I may be favoured with my payments for the work done to the Supg Engr's quarters newly finished by me last year under orders of the Ancient Supdt. The same was transferred by your honor to the Eastern Div Officer in order to settle the payments due to me after due consideration on my poor case. He (the Div Officer) Mr Hughes after a lapse of four months, that is, on the 6th December /86, granted to me the Endorsement No 835 – copy of it is herein enclosed – for master's kind perusal and justice. In which it is plainly stated in the 6th para of the Endorsement under reply that only Rs 183-6-6 have been due to me according to the final bill, which I have
refused

bricks, square bricks &ca were supplied by him from my stock, on the condition that I would be paid for them either from his or from Accountants' pocket. Your honour also can find out that some of the above materials were also taken to accountant's house from the Sup. Engr's quarters by kindly perusing the Lock register &ca referred to by me above — Most kind hearted Sir, the Sup. Engr's quarters and the accountant's house also both erected with my materials of above sorts — If your honour please to examine both buildings, then, your honour can easily trace out that the bricks, tiles, terrace bricks &ca &ca on both of them are resemble with each other upon which your honour may decide that I have been cheated in every respect by both of them regarding my payments —

At the time of Mr. Hughes examining in public office about my money due by him, the accountant said to him that he knew nothing of me and of my materials which were really supplied by accountant from my own stock —

I, in conclusion, most humbly beg to submit your honour will be pleased to depute either a overseer or a draughtsman to measure up all the work done both to Sup. Engr's quarters and Lock office etc lately dismantled by the order of the Sub. Dn. officer J. E. Somers Esq. Engineer for the Construction of new Lock — and to compare the work done with that of the sanctioned Estimates of those buildings — and then kindly deduct all

all the materials supplied to me from each of the subhead of these Estimates — as per my statement enclosed for perusal and then to support me from undergoing such heavy loss as this — I further beg to bring to your honour notice that I could not get justice if these papers be sent on to Eastern Division officer for enquiry as before — your honour may be pleased to easily find out the irregular transactions made by both of them regarding my payments by kindly perusing the Lock Register &ca mentioned by me above

For which act of kindness, I shall as in duty bound — ever pray —

I beg to remain &ca

21st April /89

(Sd) V. Ghantiala

E.8
PW 6776
3457

To
G. T. Walch Esquire
Supdg Engineer
First Circle

The humble petition from Contractor V. Sitummaliatty Gurunatha of Dowlaiswaram

Most Honored Sir,

(1) I most humbly beg to bring to your honor's notice that I have submitted a petition on the 21st April /87 in which it is clearly stated of all my dues on Supdg Engr's quarters as well as for petty repairs done to other buildings — as per my letter and statement both dated 1—1—87, therein enclosed —

I further beg to bring to your honor's notice that I have shown in my above petition that all irregular transactions made by both of the accountant and the Ancient Supdt regarding bricks &ca by kindly perusing the time table of Punt No 39, Lock Register and boat note Counterfoil for the month of August /85 and at the same time I also begged master to enquire into my poor case personally so that the truth can easily find out by kindly perusing the above documents —

(2) I beg to enclose for master's kind perusal the copy of the Time table of Punt No 39 and boat note Counterfoil for August /85 in which, it will be seen that on the 5th Augt /85 — 9700 Terrace bricks 3000 flat tiles and 2850 pantiles were despatched to Supdg Engr's quarters and unloaded there by the Maistry incharge and the same was distinctly proved by 8 witnesses before Joint Magistrate that the Terrace bricks have been sent through bandies to the accountants' house by Ancient Supdt — Besides the boat note counterfoil kept on work, Lock Register and Time table of punt No 39 are tally to each other; but the original boat note (foil) differs from those three — By this only

C.E.
C.W. 6974/
345

To, G. T. Walch Esquire
Sup. g. Engineer First Circle

The humble representation of Contractor Vishwana-te Ghantekar on Sup. g. Engr's quarters at Dowlaish

Most Honord Sir,

I most humbly beg to bring to your honor's notice that I have submitted several petitio to your honor begging to justify the irregular transactions made by both of the ancient Supdt and the Eastern Div. accountant, regarding my dues for the completion of the Sup. g. Engr's quarter &ca &ca but I am not in receipt of your hono reply even to one of my humble requests -

With regard to my dues I submitted all the req informed regarding the irregularities made by of them in my petitions dated 21st April and 25 May/87 — in which your honor can easily fi out the truth of my petitions and the way of the deceitful transactions The Sessions Judg also declared in his judgment dated 11-7-87 that they are both guilty by misappropriating the properties of both of mine and of government -

Your honor may also be pleased to get a copy of the judgment issued by Sessions Judge in which your honor may that they both are caught hold of their cheating in several wa I further beg to bring to your honor's notice that in addition to these two official Some of the Ancient Supdt's Subordinates also joined in this matter and deceived m and the Govt by preparing false documen Such as boat notes &ca which will be prov by by kindly perusing the judgment under reference

These are the present brick kiln gumastah and the present ancient maistry who signed the false foil of the boat — In this way they all joined together and crushed me in several ways and cheated the Govt.

Most kind hearted Sir, I believe my master is only my supporter and benefactor and I am of opinion that your honor is only the gentleman who finds and grants justice in such cases — I believe now that my sadful circumstances will be settled by master as soon as your honor peruses the judgment —

I further beg to bring to your honor's notice that the Punt No 39 which conveyed 9700 terrace bricks on the 5th August /85 also conveyed some terrace bricks without showing the number or quantity of the bricks thus sent. This will be seen by your honor by kindly perusing the Copy of the Time table enclosed to my petition dated 25/5/87 — This is also a big mistake of them

Under these circumstances I most respectfully beg the favour of your honor to issue orders for disbursing all my dues as per my letter and the statement both dated 18th January /87 and thereby to support me and my poor family. In case of your honor not willing to settle this matter, I at last beg the favour of your honor to grant me copies of all my petitions and statement submitted to your honor for justice since August /86. in order to submit the same to the Govt. for justice with regard to my dues for completing the Superintending Engineer's quarters &ca &ca

For which act of kindness I shall as in duty bound ever pray —

I beg to remain
Most Honored Sir
Your most obedt. Servt.
(Sd) V. Ghantkale

20th July 1887

[illegible]

6
E.4

P.W. ~~0776~~/87
3457/88

(copy)

To,
G. T. Walch Esquire
Supg Engineer in ch
First Circle, Dowlaishwaram

The humble petition of Vishnumahanty Gautiah contractor on Supg Engrs quarters &ca completed under orders of Ancient Supdt. M.R.Ry. D Ramanadhadu garu

Most Honored Sir,

I most humbly beg to lay the few following lines before your honor for favourable and kind consideration with full hope that my humble request will meet with success

Last year, I was entrusted with the following buildings for constructing and repairing them.

Supg Engrs quarters at Dowlaishwaram.

I completed this building with utmost difficulty to the entire satisfaction of late Supg Engr Coll B. Montgomerie. The walls of this building were 40 ft in height and it was erected on scaffoldings. I completed the whole of the building with the exception of the wood work for which, I received upto date a sum of Rs 2200 and odd on different occasions. I still have to receive nearly Rs 2000 and odd more for the final payments of my work done to the building.

Lock office sheds at Dowlaishwaram.

The whole of the building was completed

by the Lime Veluguma state C. Ramamurti which
I think was handed over to your honor by that officer
for disposal & by perusing the statement your
honor may think of them, that they are doing
some irregularities under masters' [illegible] orders.
Most kind hearted Sir, if your honor neglects
in my poor case I shall have to go down the river
with my large family consisting of 7 brothers and
their families as I have borrowed money
from several of the Shavakars from whom I
am troubling much for their money -
I further beg to bring to your honor's kind notice
that 21000 bricks took from my brick fields without
intent - and used them to Supg Engrs quarters
at the place where there was no such provision
in the Estimate - In these places my [illegible]
work was [illegible] for I will have to receive
the value of them also.
In conclusion I most humbly solicit your
honor will be pleased to measure all the
buildings personally and to kindly issue orders
for my payment and thereby to protect me
and my poor family instead of falling into
[illegible] to which affects my life
[illegible] the [illegible] to remain
I beg to remain Sir
3rd August 188[illegible]
Your most obdt servt
Vishnukanty Ghantiate

2 11 [illegible]

8/[illegible] 87

2457

No 835 Petition of Vishnukanty Ghantiate to the Supg Engr
dated 6th August 1886 -

(1) The first claim is for Rs 51-7-7 for work done in
connection with the Lock Establishment quarters at
Dowlaishwaram - The Sub Div officer reports that the
work was given to and done by petitioner's brother
Subbarayudu in whose name a bill for about the same
amount has been made -

(2) The second claim is for white washing the ol[illegible]
bungalow of Executive Engr Rs 34-0-9 - From the
accounts it appears that men were employed
in whitewashing and doing sundry repairs from 21st
May/85 and that they were paid for this work - There
is nothing to show that any work was done from
16-19th June/85 as claimed by petitioner

(3) Claim for Rs 16-14-9 for labour employed
from 6th to 15th July in whitewashing the serva[nts]
quarters, cook house and pigeon house of Supg Eng[r]
From the accounts it is found that repairs were
carried in February and Rs 14-10-6 paid
labour - Again [illegible] Bobbette was pai[d]
for other work done in May/86 - There is nothing
shows that any work was done in July -

4 - Repairing and white washing the small bun[galow]
in Supg Engrs compound Rs 13-9-6 from 2[illegible]
June to 4th July/85 - From the accounts it
found that Bobbette was paid for work done in
There is nothing to support petitioner's Clai[m]

5 Lock office shed - Claim Rs 27-8-6
dismantling and putting Temporary shed, on Ex[illegible]
it is ascertained that petitioner removed
roof for which he has already been paid - In
of delay on his part his brother was in -

to do the remaining work.

6. Supg. Engrs quarters. There were 9 contractors engaged on this work. Petitioner it appears was employed only to supply labour for building on going through the accounts there appears no reason to believe that all the labour performed has not either been paid for or included in the final bill for Rs 183-6-6 which petitioner has refused to sign. The total value of work done by him is shown by the subsidiary accounts ~~shown~~ to be Rs 2542-10-11. The contractor includes in his claim the value of 21000 bricks which he says were taken for this work without indent. There is found no ground for supposing that bricks were supplied for this work except from the quarry stock and it is found that he was been paid by the quarry office for a very large number of bricks. If he can give accounts of all the bricks which he supplied to the quarry then these accounts will be compared with the bills.

(Sd) W. Hughes
Executive Engineer

6th December/86
Despd 10-12-86

E.3
PH 6976
34 87
88

(a)

245

Estimate for constructing Supg. Engineer's quarters at Dowlais

Lower Story

Description of work — Rate per — Amount

2100 Cft of Quarry rubbish under concrete 2-[illegible] per 100 cft = 77-0-0
105.12 cft of concrete [illegible]
223. Do of brick in [illegible] 6-[illegible] Do = 683-0-0
1075 Do Do circle work [illegible] Do = 2461-0-0
200 Squares of Honey comb work 18-0-0 Do = 194-0-0
150 cft of cut stone for steps 6-0-0 per [illegible] = 12-0-0
2.15 Sqft of Dressed faces including pointing 0-[illegible] per sft = [illegible]
2800 sft Flooring with 9" square bricks on bed of concrete 4" thick including pointing at 11-0-0 per 100 sqft = 264-0-0
2,70 sft Flooring with 6" concrete and plastered with Portland cement marking with diagonal squares and complete at [illegible]-0-0 per cft = 102-0-0
9 No Cut stone Columns (Dowlaishwaram Stone) 10-0-0 Each = 190-0-0
Do Do for posts (Bdamgi Stone) 14-0-0 Do = 42-0-0
43 Rgft Perforated parapet including plastering complete 0-15-0 per Rgft = 134-0-0
6 Do Gutter Parapet with bricks and plaster complete 0-12-0 per Rgft = 42-0-0
00 Rgft Cornice 0-4-0 per Do = 75-0-0
5.25 sqft of plastering with 2 coats in chunam 3-0-0 per [illegible] = 526-0-0
5 sft Terrace roofing with bricks on edge 3" of kunkur and one course of 9" square bricks set diagonally pointed and 2 coats of plaster to ceiling complete at Rs 20-0-0 per 100 sft = 610-0-0
squares of pointing out side of doors with 2 coats at 4-0-0 per 100 sft = 30-0-0

Upper Story

25 cft of brick in mortar at Rs 17-8-0 per 100 cft
cft Do arch Do at " 18-8-0 Do = 984-0-0
Do of cutstone 0-6-0 per cft = 88-0-0
Do Cutstone Columns 10-0-0 Each = 4-0-0
ft Cornice work at 0-4-0 per Rgft = 30-0-0
squares Plastering two coats Rs 3-4-0 per square = 60-0-0
= 330-0-0

17 Squares of Terrace roofing with terrace bricks on edge 3" of kunkur and 3 courses of flat tiles and three courses of pantiles and 3 coats to [illegible] complete at Rs 22 per square

21.5 Squares of Tiled roofing with teak wood ~~[illegible]~~ rafters reeper batts flat and pantiles compt at 11-8-0 per square } 247 —

19.75 Do Do for lower floor at [illegible] = 227 —

364 Rft- Perforated parapet with brick in mortar at Rs 1-0-0 per Rft- } = 364

575 sqrs of painting exposed doors and windows at Rs 4-4-0 } [illegible]

457

11/[illegible]

Statement of labour to be received by Contractor Vistumalcauty Ghantiali for Completing the Sergt Engrs quarters at Dowlaish after deducting the value of materials, grinding, unloading and conveying charges on each sub head of Sanctioned Estimate

17.

22375 Cft. or 829 Cyds of Rubble masonry at Rs 11-0-0 per 100 Cft } Rs 2461

Deduct-

Value of 829 Cyds of Roughstone at 5 + 6 = 11 annas per cyd for quarrying & carting charges } 570

Do of 27½ garces lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 399

Do of 55 garces sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 69

Charges for grinding 27½ garces lime at Rs 5 per garce = 137½

Cartage and unloading charges at Rs 1 per garce = 27½

1203

Net total labour on Rubble masonry — Rs — = 1258

1075 Cft. or 40 Cyds Brick arch work at Rs 18 per 100 cft = 194

Value of 20000 bricks at 500 per cyd at Rs 6 per 1000 = Rs 120.

Do of 1⅓ garce of lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 19¼

Do of 3 Do of sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 4

Grinding charges of lime at Rs 5 per garce = 6¾

Cartage and unloading charges on bricks and lime at Rs 1-0-0 } = 13

163

Net total labour — Rs = 31

200 Sqrs Honey Comb work at Rs 6 per sqre = 12

Value of 2000 pantiles at Rs 1-12-0 per 1000 = 3½

Do of lime sand &ca &ca = ½

4

Net total labour Rs = 8.

Brought forward = Rs 1297

0 Cft Cut stone for steps at 6 annas per Cft } = Rs 56 -a-a

ductions

e of 150 Cft Cut stone quarried at 1 anna per cft } = 9½

of 1/6 garce of lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 3

o of ½ Do sand at Rs 1¼ Do = ½

untage, unloading and grinding charges including cartage for 2 miles on 150 Cft } = 4

17

Net Total Labour Rupees = 39

215 Sqft or 6 Cyds dressed faces including pointing at Rs 11 per 100 Sqft } = 24

Deduct Value of 6 Cyds Selected building stone at 8 annas per Cyd } = 3-a-a

Carting charges on 6 Cyds at 6 annas per Cyd = } = 2-4-0

Value of ¼ garce lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 3-10-0

Do of ½ Do sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 0-10-0

Grinding charges including puntage and unloading } = 1-8-0

11

Net total Labour Rupees = 13

2800 Sqft Flooring with 9" square bricks on a bed of Concrete 4" thick including pointing at Rs 6¾ per sqft = 189

Deduct Value of 5000 bricks 9" square at Rs 8 per 100 sqft } = 40-a-a

Do of ½ garce of lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 7-4-0

Do of 1 Do sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 1-4-0

Puntage and unloading charges on bricks = 3-8-0

Grinding unloading & Puntage on lime = 3-a-a

55

134

C/O = 1483

Brought forward = Rs 1483

279 Sqft Flooring with 6" concrete and plastered with Portland cement making with diagonal square complete at Rs 8 per square } Rs 102

Deduct Value of 23½ Cyds Concrete at 0-12-0 per Cyd = 17-10-0

Charges for laying 23½ Cyds 0-8-0 per Cyd = 11-12-0

Value of ¾ garce lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 10-14-0

Do of 1½ Do sand Rs 1¼ Do = 2-a-a

Do of 2 Bags Portland cement at Rs 7 Each = 14-a-a

Grinding charges of lime = 3-12-0

Puntage and unloading charges of lime = 1-a-a

61

Net Total labour Rupees = 41

143 Rgft Perforated parapet including plastering complete at 15 annas per Rgft } = 134

Value of 3500 bricks at Rs 6 per 1000 = 21-a-a

Do of 1/3 garce of lime at Rs 14½ garce = 5-a-a

Do of 2/3 Do of sand Rs 1¼ Do = 1-a-a

Charging for grinding, unloading, Puntage on bricks and lime } = 3-a-a

30

Net total labour Rupees = 104

56 Rgft Gotteree parapet and brick and plaster complete at 12 annas per Rgft } = 42

Value of 1500 bricks at Rs 6 per 1000 = 9-a-a

Do of 6 parras lime = 2-a-a

Do of 12 Do sand 0-4-0

Grinding &ca charges on bricks and lime = 1-12-0

12

Net Total Rupees = 30

C/O = 1658

Brought forward Rs 297

60 Rgft Cornice work at 4 annas pr Rgft = 75-0-0
Value of 2500 bricks at Rs 6 pr 1000 = Rs 15-0-0
Do of 6 paras lime at Rs 14½ pr garce = 2-0-0
Do of 12 Do Sand Rs 1¼ Do = 0-4-0
Grinding &ca charges on bricks & lime = 3-12-0 21
Net total labour Rupees = 54

75.25 Squares of Plastering with 2 coats of Chunam at Rs 3 pr sq } = 526

Value of shell chunam and sand for it at 0-8-0 pr square } = 88-0-0
Value of 6 garces lime at Rs 14½ pr garce = 87-0-0
Do of 12 Do sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 15
Grinding charges on 6 garces lime at Rs 5 Do = 30-0-0
Pantage and unloading charges on lime at Rs 1 Do = 6-0-0 226
Net total labour Rs = 300-0-0

86.50 Squares Terrace roofing with brick on Edge 3" of Kunker & 1 Course of 9" Square bricks at diagonally pointed and two Coats plaster to Ceiling complete at Rs [illegible] pr square } 610
Value of 61000 Terrace bricks at Rs 2-6-0 pr 1000 = 145
Do of 5000 bricks 9" Square at Rs 8 pr 1000 = 40
Do of 2 Garces of lime at Rs 14½ pr garce = 29
Do of 4 Do Sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 5
Grinding Charges = 10
Pantage on bricks and lime including unloading } = 10 239

371

C/O = 2383

Brought forward Rs 2383

5625 Cft Rough stone to Upper stone at Rs 11 pr 100 cft = 609
Deduct value of 208 Cyds of Rough stone at Rs 5 + 6 = 11 annas pr cyd } = 148
Do of 7 garces of lime at Rs 14½ pr garce = 101½
Do of 14 Do of Sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 17½
Grinding Charges on lime at Rs 5 Do = 35
Do for lime including pantage at Rs 1 pr Do = 7 309
Net total labour Rs = 300

475 Cft Arch work at Rs 18½ pr 100 cft = 88
Value of 9000 bricks at Rs 6 pr 1000 = 54-0-0
Do of ½ garce lime at Rs 14½ pr garce = 7-4-0
Do of 1 Do Sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 1-4-0
Grinding Charges = 2-8-0
Pantage on bricks = 2-0-0
Unloading Do = 4-8-0
Do Lime = 0-8-0 72
Net total labour Rs = 16-0

10 Cft Cut stone at 0-6-0 pr cft = 4
Deduct value of 10 cft stone quarried at 1½ annas pr cft } = 1
Net Total labour Rs = 3-0

240 Rgft Cornice Work at 0-4-0 pr Rgft = 60
Value of 2000 bricks at Rs 6 pr 1000 = 12-0-0
Do of 6 paras lime at Rs 14½ pr garce = 2-7-0
Do of 12 Do sand 0-4-0
Conveying charges including unloading = 2-5-0 17

43

C/O = 2745

80 Sqft Plastering 2 coats including white washing at Rs 3-4-0 per sq } = 330

Deduction of Value of 3 garce of lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 43½
Do of 6 Do sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 8½
Grinding Charges = = 15
Conveying and unloading lime = 3 70

Net total labour Rs = 260

7 Squares Terrace roofing with terrace bricks 2/3 of Kunker & 3 courses of flat tiles and 3 coats plastering and 2 coats Ceiling at Rs 22 per 100 sq ft } 374

Value of 34000 terrace bricks at Rs 2-6-0 per 1000 = 80-12-0
Do of 30000 Pantiles at Rs 1-12-0 Do = 52-8-0
Do of 85000 flat tiles at Rs 1-6-0 Do = 11-12-0
Do of 1½ garce of lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 21-12-0
Do of 3 Do of sand at Rs 1¼ Do = 3-12-0
Grinding lime = 7-8-0
Conveying bricks, tiles at Rs 2½ per (6 boat loads) = 15-0-0
Unloading Charges to Do = 19-0-0
Conveying and unloading lime = 2-0-0 214

Net Total labour Rs = 160

21.60 Squares of Tiled roofing with teak wood reepers, rafters, reeper with flat and Pantiles complete at Rs 11-8-0 per square } 247

19.75 Do Do to lower story at Do = 227
474

41.40

Deduct Value of 74000 Pantiles at Rs 1¾ per 1000 = 129-8-0
Do of Do 20500 Flat tiles at Rs 1-6-0 per 1000 = 28-0-0
Do of ¾ garce of lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 11-0-0
Do of 70 cft Teakwood wrought & put up at Rs 2½ per cft = 175-0-0
Do of 1½ garce sand at Rs 1¼ per garce = 2-0-0
Pustage on flat and pantiles at Rs 2½ (5 boat loads) = 12-0-0
Unloading Do at Rs 2 per 1000 = 12-0-0
Grinding Pustage & unloading ¾ garce of lime = 4-8-0 374

Net total labour Rs = 100

364 Rg ft Perforated parapet with brick in mortar at Rs 1 per Rg ft } 364

Deduct Value of 9000 bricks at Rs 6 per 1000 = 54-0-0
Do of 1 garce of lime at Rs 14½ per garce = 14-8-0
Do of 2 Do at Rs 1¼ Do = 2-8-0
Grinding one garce of lime = 5-0-0
Conveying and unloading = 1-0-0
Pustage on bricks at Rs 2 per 2 boat loads = 5-0-0
Unloading charges = 4-0-0 86

Net total Labour Rs = 278

6 Centrings large at Rs 4 Each = 24
58 Do Small at Rs 1-4-0 Each 72
Scaffoldings = 200

C/O Rs = 3839-0-0

Brought forward =	Rs 297
ra works done by me to the Supg Engrs quarters which not provided in the Estimate and which were executed me under the orders of the Anicut Supdt-	
Pork work with Cutstone and Dressed faces on Southern side the Building in quarters (lower) story-	90-0-0
Nice chunam work done to two small porticos made of wood western side of the bungalow	40-0-0
Erecting cross walls with bricks in 3 bath rooms lower and upper stories including plastering and Cornice works to the walls-	74-0-0
1) Fixing cutstones on all corners of the walls of lower and upper stories	10-0-0
5) Fixing cutstones under all windows and 6) boring holes in door frames of all rooms &ca	= 7-0-0
7) Several other works which are to be known by kindly inspecting the bungalow and which will be shown by me when master pleases to come there for inspection	110-0-0
Also value of 21000 bricks at Rs 6 per 1000 supplied without Indent and for which value will be received As per my letter dated 6th August /86	126-0-0
	4359-0-
Deduction	
Amount already paid to me by cheques on different occasions	2359-0
Total Rupees	2000-0

aid to me for my supplying labour

1887

To

The Secretary to Govt
Madras
Fort Saint George

The humble petition of Vistumahanty Ghantiah
Contractor on Supg. Engineers Quarters newly erected in
Dowlaishwaram

Most Honored Sir

I most humbly and respectfully beg to say the following few lines before your honor for favourable and kind Consideration with full hope that my humble request will meat with success-

Most kind Lorded Sir, I completed the Supg. Engineer's quarters in the month of march /86, and from April /86, I have, several times, begged the Anicut Supdt. for my final payments for its compleation- He replied to me that he would prepare bills whenever I asked him for payment- but not do. I, at last, presented a petition dated 6th August /8 to the Supg. Engineer, begging to issue orders to the Anicut Supdt. to settle my payments- In the mean time the Anicut Supdt. and the Accountant of the Eastern Division joined together and prepared a bill for Rs 483-6 and produced it to the Dl. office, when the Supg. Engineer refferred my petition to the Executive Engineer for disposal- The Executive Engineer asked me to take the money I informed him that I will have to receive nearly Rs 2000 and odd for my completing of the building and for which I can produce a statement of labour supplied by me for its completion accordingly I submitted to that office a petition together with a statement dated 1/1/87, upon

I should have to receive the value of the t the rate of — Rs 15 per 1000 — by kindly perusing ie table, Brick register; and judgement, all the gular transactions will invariably be found and which your honor may be pleased to judge whether petitions are correct their transactions are correct — besides, the brick manufacture is done on behalf of Govt on there is no order for issuing even a piece without first obtaining permission from his DL officer he, (the Anicut Supdt.), without first taking permission, issued all sorts of bricks to the Accountants house and puntage is charged to the Supg. Engineers quarters for the materials carted to the Accountants house (his friend) in order to show some profit to him and your honor may also be pleased to consider that almost all of the transactions are wrong, by kindly perusing the above documents as well as the undermentioned copies of the registered petitions addressed to the Supg. Engineer regarding my payments due to the comletion of the Supg. Engineers Quarters

In order to deceive me and the Govt. they are all joined together and prepared a false; foil of boat note which was caught hold by the Sessions Judge and stated this in his judgement here in enclosed

The Executive Engineer again on the 9th August 87, sent me a registered order saying that he woul

credit the amount of Rs 183-6-6 if I did not take the amount within a month. I further beg to bring to your honors notice that I have two times begged the Supg. Engineer to favour me with all the copies of petitions as well as statement in order to submit them to your honor for justice he did not grant me reply even to them also.

If your honor may be pleased to examine the timetable, judgement and boat note counterfoils and all the copies of my petitions it will be plainly shown that I was crushed by them under these circumstances. most humbly beg to Solicit your honor w be pleased to grant me justice on the subject, after kindly enquiring poor case as I have been bur ~~which a~~ heavy debt of nearly Rs. and odd —

unless your honor pleases to g justice on my poor case I will to go down the river with my poor and large family. I moreover beg to bring to your honors notice that the late DL officer stated in his order No 885 dated 6th December 186 that I have been employed to supply labour for the erection, by which I obliged to claim as per my Statement dated 1st January 1887

Awaiting for favorable and kind orders

6654L

297

and I cannot get justice of th

are again sent to Supg Engineer

for disposal.

Dowlaishwaram
31st August 1887 } I beg to remain
Most Honored Sir
Your most obdt Servant

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
GENL No 255
14 OCT. 87
EASTERN DIVISION GODAVARI

R 6.9

No 3070 dated 12th Sept

Forwarded to the Sup
Engineer I Circle f
report.

(By Order)
W C Baddeley Capt
Dy. Chief Engr. P.W.
8/9/87

R. 10.9.87

---

(1)

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
GENL No 499
17 DEC. 87
EASTERN DIVISION GODAVARI

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
25 NOV 87
P.W. DEPARTMENT MADRAS

To,
The Secretary to Govt. D.P.W.
Madras
Fort Saint George.

The humble petition of Contractor Vistunabauty
Gautcale on Supg Engr's quarters Dowlaishwaram

Most Honored Sir,

I most humbly beg to bring to your ho
notice that the papers refered to the Supg Engr Ist Circle
were sent to Eastern Divn Office for his report - that officer on
his receipt, put some questions to the Ancient Supdt.
whether he has any connection with the house lately built by
Accountant at Dowlaishwaram - upon which the Anc
Supdt answered that he has no connection whatever wi
the accountant's house &ca &ca - Keeping his way of
giving false information to his Superiors - I sent
two defences to the Eastern Divn Office given by them in a
brought by me against both of the Ancient Supdt an
the Accountant in the District Munsiff's Court at
Rajahmundry, Godavari District - The Divn Office
without least consideration of them - Dispatched
his report to the Supg Engr Ist Circle - with his inform
Most kind hearted Sir, the Ancient Supdt. hi
erected the house for the use of accountant h
friend - using several of the materials sent by
to the Supg Engineer's quarters now completed
Dowlaishwaram your honor may be pleas
to consider by kindly perusing the judgment
enclosed to my first petition for your ho
kind consideration on my humble req

I have undergone much loss in
con

of the Supg Engr's quarters newly completed
Dowlaishwaram for the Supg Engr's use -
I also beg to bring to your honor's notice that
the following points will satisfy your honor
regarding the deceiptful transactions made by
the Aniecut Supdt. on my dues for the
completion of the above quarters -

(1) Preparing false boat note counterfoil and
foil - which were prepared by his gumasta
so that I may be put into troubles regard
my dues on the above building - this was done
by the Aniecut Supdt. Maistry and a gumasta
who were on Aniecut and lime manufacture
respectively - with the consent of both
the Accountant and the Aniecut Supdt. -
this will be found by kindly perusing the judgm
enclosed by me in my first petition - Al
the Sessions Judge certified that it is frame
by them falsely - yet they are born in govt.
employment - and I am only left helpless
without any enquiry made regarding the d
I will have to receive in govt. -

(2) Despatching a boat load of terrace lime
to the Supg Engr's quarters without giving
or quantity of the material this despatch
and it is also noted by the Sessions Judge

.9.87. R. 10.9.87

his judgment that the [illegible]rage bricks were Carted by bandies to the Accountants house

There is no such practice of despatching material without giving number or quantity in any District - By so doing - there is no reason for how many material will be billed on the work to which they were despatched - The time Table proves that this done by the consent of the Assist superintendent - your honor may be pleased to kindly enquire whether there is such practice of despatching material without num or quantity of the material thus despatched In this manner the Assist Sup. and his subordinates deceived me and put me in much debts -

(3) Charging the Punt lascars wage to the government work for the materials plainly sent to a private party - this m be seen by your honor by kindly perusi the Wages bill of Punt No 39 for the mont of August 1885 - All these documen are produced in the joint magistrates Court at Rajahmundry - anothe

in

were all thrown to me when the case is in trial - The Assist Supdt. put me in such a trouble - so that I may be go down the river with my large family with all my heavy debts - for the completion of the Supg Engr's quarters

(4) Sending materials (wall and well bricks) to the Supg Engr's quarters both in private and Govt. boats - For which a lot of money is to be paid to me - I am not as yet i receipt of even a single pie for these value, although nearly 3 years elapsed - Thi will be found by kindly perusing the Lock Register of Dowlaishwaram Lock for the year 1885/86 - The despatch of the abov material is occurred between the months of Augt and November/85 -

(5) The questions put by the Eastern Div. office to the Assist Superintenden regarding the Connection he has to th Accountants house lately bui at Dowlaishwaram for the use of his (the Assist Supdts friend) friend - (Al

the Ancient supt. in every respect regarding
my dues on Supg Engr's quarters gives false
information to his superiors - your honour
may be pleased to kindly consider on the
last point - Although he himself erected
the accountant's house yet he gave his
answer that he has no connection whatev
to its construction - By which reason on
your honour may be pleased to consi
of his intention regarding my dues
Upon which I submitted the copies of
Defences given by both of them in the
District munsiffs' court Rajahm
in a suit brought against them
to the Executive Division Office
for his kind consideration on my
dues - If wanted, I can produ
your honour the stamped docum
of the Defences given by both of
Ancient Supdt, and the Accountant
lately transferred to Central Office

I further beg to bring to your honors notice that I cannot get my payments if my papers are referred again – As I have not received any kind of Even answer to my several petition to the Supg. Engr 1st Circle, on account of my bad days.

Most kindhearted Sir, the person who deceived me and the governme are all right but. I was only put in troubles by heavy debts for the Completion of the Supg Engrs Qu I have no more benefact but your honor only I believe in master only is my benefa and protector – I have been really into much troubles by the Account

Under these Circumstances, I most humbly beg to solicit your honor will be pleased to kindly consider on my poor Circumstances and to kindly issue orders for the early payment of all my dues regarding the work done by me to the Sup. Engr's after kindly perusing the Documents &c enclosed to my first petition as well as the questions put by the Eastern Division Division office and the Answers given by the Assist. Supdt. and thereby to support me and my poor family from falling into such heavy loss.

For which act of kindness, I shall as in duty bound. Ever pray-

I beg to remain
Most Honored Sir
Your most obdt. Servt.

5-12-87 P.W.C. No ~~9607~~

1/1836 a 2/87

P. W. Dept.

To be returned with reply.

Rg 25.11.87

No 4333C of 29th November /87.

Referred to the Supdg. Engr I Circle for report in continuation of Endorsement No 3070 C dated 12th September 1887.

[illegible], Colonel R.E.
Chief Engr. P.W. Dept.
28.11.87

To
The Supdg. Engr. I Circle

to be returned

16-12-87

1653 G.P.

C No: 3457

No. 85 G.D.

FROM,

G. T. Walch Esqre
~~THE~~ SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWARAM, 7th April 1388
Despd 10/4

SIR,

1. With reference to your No 3070× 12-9-87 I have the honor to report that the matter had before had careful investigation of Mr Hughes whilst he was in charge of the Eastern Division and he decided that nothing more was due to the petitioner than the sum offered him; Mr Paul now in charge of the Division had also arrived at the same conclusion but has at my request again gone into the matter and reports that he "cannot find that anything else is due to the Petitioner" and I am of the same opinion.

×Returned with all enclosures.

2. In 1885 Whilst the Supdg. Engineer's house was being built under charge of D. Ramanna Naidu, then Sub Division officer, there seem to have been transactions, to say the least of them

injudicious, which some how mixed up to a certain extent some of the materials obtained for that work with those obtained by the then Accountant of the Eastern Division (A. Ranga Row) for a house he was building at the same time in the town of Dowlaishwaram - and this resulted in an action? prosecution for libel by the Accountant against a gumastah - the action being sustained in the Court of the Joint Magistrate of the District but reversed on the appeal of the Gumastah by the Sessions Judge; it is a copy of his judgment which forms the enclosure to the petition under notice -

3. That the petitioner may not have been treated fairly as regards some of the materials & labour which were supplied to the Accountant's house is possible enough and that he may consider the Anicut Superintendent responsible for his loss in the matter is also possible enough though it is only fair to say that the Anicut Supt. denies "any connection with the construction of the house of late Accountant A. Rangarow."

4. I am of opinion that the Petitioner can only be left to establish any claims he may believe that he has by an action in a Civil Court against the Anicut Supt. or any one whom he considers responsible -

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedient St.

Supt. Engineer 1st Circle.

mc
Ct

No. 4333 C a/ 29-11-87
" 3070 C a/ 12-9-87.
" 1009/1010 C a/ 9-3-88.

FROM, P.W. No. 3457

G. T. Walch Esqr
~~THE~~ SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED 7th
DESPTCHED 10th } April 1888
RECEIVED 14

No. 85 G.D.

ENCLOSURES. 2.

SUBJECT.

No 1225 W d/ 25th April 1888

Contractor Vistnumahanty Guntiah —.

Forwards a report on the sums due to —.

0/19/4 — 0.1.5 92/IV Hum: 26-4-88 L: 23/4

C No. 3457

Note

This is a petition from one Ghanthiah, contractor employed in supplying labour and bricks for the construction of quarters for the Supg Engr I circle at Dowlaishweram. He alleges to have carried out other works also — namely "completing the Lock office shed at Dowlaishweram", &c — He has not been fully paid for his work and prays therefore for payment of the balance due to him.

(A) For constructing the Supg Engr's quarters, the petitioner claims Rs 2000 as the sum still due to him — Whereas according to the statement of Mr Hughes, a Exec. Engr of the Godaver Eastern Dn in 1886, who, the Supg Engr says, made "caref investigation" of the matte the petitioner is entitled only to Rs 183-6-6, and according to the first statement of Mr Paul, now in charge of the division, the petitioner is entitled only to Rs 24-8-3. (Vide Mr Paul's endorsement* No 1238 of 22-3-87 on a petition from the petitioner). Mr Paul has, however, changed his view since, and is of opinion that Mr Hughes' calculation is correct, and the Supg Engr. concurs with Mr Paul.

There is no material difference of opinion as to the amount paid already to the petitioner, which according to Mr Hughes' calculation, is Rs 2359-4-5.

The petitioner arrives at his figure thus:

Items.	Rs - .. - ..
For work done according to the Sanctioned Est.	3839 - .. - ..
For extra works not provided for in the Est but carried out under the orders of the Assist Supdt, ~~[illegible]~~ the officer in immediate charge of the work	394 - .. - ..
For 21000* bricks supplied without indents and used at the place for which no such provision is made in the Est.	126 - .. - ..
Total	4359 - .. - ..

* This document has not been forwarded to the Govt by the Supg Engr.

* In the first petition to the Govt, the petitioner gives the number of the bricks to be 26920.

Deducting from this amount the sum already paid, the petitioner claims Rs 2000 as the sum still due to him.

To take the ~~L~~ last item first: The petitioner in support of his claim, refers the Govt to the Lock register at Dowlaishweram for 1885-86. What the Lock register shows and how far it supports the petitioner's claim, are not stated by the Supg, or the Exec. Engr.

As regards the other two items, it is to be observed that the petitioner has submitted a detailed statement of the particulars working up to the amounts claimed. There is nothing to show that the accuracy of these particulars has been questioned by the Exec. Engr; the Supg Engr communicates to the Govt the bare conclusion arrived at by the Exec. Engr, namely, that the Exec. Engr. cannot find that anything else* is due to

* Except Rs 183-6-6.

to the petitioner" and adds that he is of the same opinion with the Exe. Engr without assigning grounds for such opinion.

In the absence of full information from the Exe. Engr. such as would enable the Govt. to judge of the facts and figures of the petitioner, it is impossible to do justice to the latter in this matter.

Serious imputations* are made against the Anicut Supdt. and the Accountant of the Godavari Eastern Dn who had charge of, and control over, the accounts relating to transactions with the petitioner. That some of these imputations are not unfounded, is evident from paras 14 & 15 of the judgment of the Sessions Judge of Godavari in a case that arose out of the admittedly 'injudicious'* management by the P. W. officials of affairs while the quarters were under construction. The other imputations in support of which evidence has been adduced by the petitioner, remain unrefuted.

Under these circumstances, there

there is absolute necessity for a careful scrutiny of the subdivisional accounts upon which the settlement of the petitioner's claim has been made to depend. It may perhaps be desirable in the interests of justice that, ~~the~~ if possible, the petitioner's claim be settled independently of the subdivisional accounts.

(B) As regards the petitioner's claims in respect of other works alleged to have been executed by him, it would seem that Mr Hughes* has satisfactorily shown that nothing is due to the petitioner. In his two petitions to the Govt., the petitioner has not even distinctly alluded to these claims, and it may therefore be inferred that he has abandoned them.

---

* such as 'fabricating accounts', 'Erasing entries', 'taking Govt. bricks for private use without permission of the Divisional officer' &c

* This has been admitted by the Supg. Engr in the letter under consideration

* vide Mr Hughes' Endorsement No. 835 of 6-12-86 on a petition from the contractor to the Supg Engr.

the petitioner is trying to get Govt to pay claims which should be satisfied by the ~~Accountant~~ of the Godavari Eastern division, or by the Assist Supt, or perhaps by both. Because the petitioner has mixed up his private contracts with work given him by Govt, is no reason why the P.W. officers should be called on for further information, than they have already given.

17.4.88

The S. E. seems unable otherwise further light in the matter & has satisfied himself that the Contractor has no claim on Govt.

21/4/88

Cir 3457

D.W.

I have had this note prepared by Clerk Vaidyanatha Aiyar, B.A., & it appears to set forth fairly the facts of the case.

The S. E.'s report does not enter into the details of the case, & it seems doubtful whether a disposal can be drafted without further information.

For orders.

I do not think that the time of the P.W. officers should be further taken up in this matter. The petitioner should be told that Govt decline to interfere and that it is open to him to bring an action in a Civil Court against whomever he con… It seems to me

Cir
17.4.88

No. 1225 W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 25th April 1888

READ the following

tition from Vistumahanty Gurtiah dated 31st August 1887

do do dated 25th November/87

rom the Suptg: Engineer I Circle H. E. No. 85 G.D. d/ 7th April 1888

PPH
21 Apr

Petitioner is informed that the Government decline to interfere in the matter of his petition ~~and~~ that it is open to him to bring an action in a Civil Court against whomever he considers responsible for the amount of his claim.

(He knows this)

19.4.88

To
The Petitioner
" Suptg: Engineer I Circle

21/4/88

Cir

7-3-88

No. 1225 W. d/25th
April 18

Despd
26/4

No. 3070 C d/ 12-9-87
" 4333 C " 29-11-87

D 19/3.

PWC No 2233

R/ 6.3.88

C/ No. 1009 C d/ 9th March 1888

The petitioner is informed that the subject of his petitions of the 31st August and 25th November 1887 is under enquiry and that a reply will be sent to him in due course.

To The Petitioner ✓ 7.3.88
Despd 9.3.88
No 1010 C d/ 9-3-88
7/3/88

Copy of the above forwarded to the Superintending Engineer I Circle, in continuation of Endorsement No 4333 C. dated 29th November 1887 with request that the report called for be expedited.

To Supg: Engr: I Circle ✓ 7.3.88
Despd 9.3.88.
7/3/88

1887.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 9607

From Vistumahanty Ghantea contractor of S. E's quarters newly built at Dowlaishwa

ENCLOS.—

No.

Dated

Received 25th November 1887.

SUBJECT.

Stating that the Assistant Supt built the house for the use of the Accountant out of the materials sent by him for the quarters of the Supdg. Engr: I Circle & the money due to him has not yet been paid.

DISPOSAL.

No. 4333 C Dated 29th Novr 1887

Referred to the Supdg: Engr: I Circle for report in continuation of Endorsement No. 3070 C dated 12th September 1887.

(Sd) J. O. Hasted, Col. R.E.

Chief Engr. P.W. Dept.

To

The Supdg. Engr: I C to be returned

Ind 30/11 Despd 29-11-87.

1887.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 6976

From Vistumahanty Ghantiala contractor of S. E's quarters newly erected in Dowlaishwaram

ENCLOS.— 16

No.

Dated 31st August 1887

Received 6th Septr 1887

SUBJECT.

Stating that he completed S. E's quarters in March 1886 but has not received payment.

DISPOSAL.

No. 3070 C Dated 12th Septr 1887

Forwarded to the Supdg: Engineer I Circle for report.

(B.O.)

(Sd) H. L. C. Bardeley, Capt. R.E.

Dy. Chief Engr. P.W. Dept.

Despd

13/9/87

Ind 14/9

To,
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
Madras.

The humble petition of Contractor Vishuma-hanti Guntiale on Superintending Engineer's quarters at Dowlaishwaram

Most Honored Sir,

+ 3070C }
12-9-8
+ 4333C }
29-11-8

I most humbly beg to bring to your honor's notice that I I have submitted my petition to your honor begging to justify the irregular transactions made by the Anicut superintendent regarding my payments some six months ago. Most kind hearted sir, I am not as yet favoured with master's kind reply to my humble request. I was very much troubling by marchants from whom I borrowed money for its completion. I have submitted
all

all the papers connected with my dues for Completing the Supg. Engineer's quarters at Dowlaishwaram. I have no means of get rid of these heavy debts unless your honor justifies in the matter.

The judgment, the defences and other papers will prove the irregularities made by the Ancient supdt. regarding my money due for the completion of the above building.

Awaiting for masters kind and favourable orders on my humble request as I am suffering very much from these heavy debts for the last three years =

I beg to remain
Dowlaishwaram } Most Honored Sir
28th February 1888 } your most obdt. servt.

all th
for c
at D
of go
gov
The
pape
ma
my
of th
Au
ord
duffe
deli
Dow
28th

Stamped

To,
The Secretary to Government
Public Works Department
[illegible] ~~Fort Saint George~~
Madras

P.W.C. No 223

DOWLAISHWERAM 25 FEB 88
FORT SAINT GEORGE FIRST DELY 4 MAR 88
FORT SAINT GEORGE 2 4 MAR 88
MADRAS 1ST DELY 5 MAR 88
MADRAS FIRST DELY MAR 88