

No. 3168 Wd/22-11-87

1888.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 4055

From

The Suply. Engineer
V Circle

ENCLOS.—

No. 361

Dated 30th April 1888

Received 1st May 1888

SUBJECT.

Reporting on the several
items noted in para 3 of
G.O. 3168 W of 22-11-87
passing orders on the
Inspection Notes on the
Chingleput Dist office,
submitted by the Exr.
P.W. Accts.

DISPOSAL.

No. 1782C Dated 3rd May 1888

To.

C

For favour of
remarks.

(24) W.S.C.B.

3-5-88

D.W.

29/5

24/5

No. 361

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

V Circle, Madras,

Chepak, 30th April 1888.

From

Colonel A. M. Vibart. R.E.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, V CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
Public Works Department.

SIR,

Enclosures.

I have the honor to state that the Executive
Engineer Chingleput Division reports as follows
in the several items noted in para 3 of G.O. No
3168 W dated 22nd November 1887.

"Item No 6 of the Examiner's Summary. An estimate
of Rs 72/- was sanctioned by the Executive Engineer
for a temporary lascar under sub overseer Runga-
swami Pillai who had charge of Conjeevaram
Talug and who required the services of a lascar
when measuring work &c. The sanction was objected
to and the services of the lascar were dispensed
with on the 7th October last I would however
strongly recommend a lascar being sanctioned
for it is impossible for the sub overseer to properly
measure up work without one."

Item No 7. The delays in payment to contractors
for works measured were confined to the Trivellore

Sub

Sub Division under the charge of Mr. C. Muham-
- mad Khasim from whom bills were often
received late and which had in many cases to
be returned for some correction or other.

Item No 16. Honorary Assistant Engineer Mr.
Muhammad Khasim Sahib explains the dis-
- crepancies referred to in paras 33 to 36 as
follows:-

"That the said difference was for work (turned
out by Contractor J. Sundara Mudali after
31st of August 1886 the date of the cancellation
of his contract) which Captain Langley refused
to pay at first and which he paid subsequently
in final settlement of all the demands on that
work. The two measurements as will be noted
in the book smaller pits of 31-8-86 enlarged &
subsequently which the overseer measured again
on 25-9-86 were checked by me on 29th
September 1886".

In the revised bill the date of measurement
by the overseer should be 25-9-86 and not 31-8-86
as mentioned and as erroneously entered
in the revised final bill. On referring to the
measurement book which will be forwarded
as soon as it can be spared no discrepancies
has been discovered.

The

The fact that the contractor did further
work after the cancellation of his contract
and that the work was not included in the
first final bill does not appear to have
been previously reported by the sub divisional
officer.

The payment on the revised final bill
was made on the 7th April last when the
Divisional Accountant was absent on leave
for the Easter Holidays and therefore the
circumstances under which the final pay-
- ment was made to the contractor are not
known to the office.

If the mistake in the date of measurement
by the overseer had been discovered by Mr.
Muhammad Khasim when he signed the
revised final bill and if the payment
had been made a day earlier when it
would have been audited by the Divisional
Accountant this reference would have
been avoided.

Item No 23. The disputed liabilities
referred to Contractor J. Subraya Mudali
on account of.