3302 W 2.12.87

P.W. Cw. 78 4/8

Govt. of {1888} Madras.

REVENUE.

24.S.C-

Issued

Recd. 10 - 8 - 88. *Encl.*

G.O., 23rd July 1888, No. 506.

No. 2471 W. d/ 14th August 1888

JULY.

Court of Wards Report for Fasli 1296.

Review of —.

O.L.S 12/8/88 / M. 8.8.88

2 copies to B.O.

14/8

No. 2471 W. d/ 14th August 1888

O.L.S 12/8/88 / M. 8.8.88

18/8

33

No. 2471 W.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 14th August 1888

READ the following

Proceedings of the Revenue Depts: M.E. No 506 of 23rd July 1888.

—

Communicated to Superintending Engineers concerned who will report on the cause of the short outlay on Public Works in charge of this Department. The reports should be accompanied by statements in detail of the works sanctioned for execution, the allotments made for them, and the sums actually spent. The budget allotments should work up to the totals shown in the statement appended to para 23 of the report of the Court of Wards.

7/8/88

2 copies to [illegible] 15/8

Supg: Engr I Circle ✓
Do. III Circle ✓
Do. VI Circle ✓
Chief Engr for Irrigr. with RSC

15/8 R.S.

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of Referencer.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			

[R.O. / 10]
10,000-19-5-11.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Block No. 3

Paper taken out of the Records from the charge of the Referencer,

Dept. P.W.D Press/Mis./Rout. No. 2473, dated 14-8 ~~191~~ 1888 . Rack No. . Range,

Date taken out.	For what purpose.			Initials of Referencer.	Date returned.	Initials of attender.
	Department.	C. No.	Year.			
18/12/11	Revenue	4536	/11	CB	6/8/12	

To

THE SECRETARY TO THE

CHIEF COMMISSIONER, C. P., D. P. W.,

Nagpore.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF P. BUTCHIAH,
LATE CLERK SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE, UPPER GODAVERY
CIRCLE.

SHEWETH,

1. That your Petitioner humbly solicits the liberty of appealing to you in the following case, praying that you will be graciously pleased to take it into your benevolent consideration, and to grant him justice.

2. That your Petitioner humbly begs to state that he was first employed in the Department in 1847, and has ever since been in continuous service.

3. That, prior to his transfer to the Upper Godavery in 1861, as Head Accountant, *vide* Proceedings of the Madras Government, 22nd May 1861, No. 783, copy of which is enclosed, your Petitioner had been Head Writer in the Ganjam District Engineer's Office, D. P. W., Madras Presidency.

4. That your Petitioner having the charge of the office, as Accountant, District Engineer's Office Upper Godavery, endeavoured with zeal and diligence in introducing the different forms of Accounts, Returns, &c., clearing the previous arrears, and collecting the various records which had previously been in a confused state; and that he generally managed the office duties when the Executive Establishments were but newly entertained in 1861, the clerks possessed little or no experience, and there was scarcely a form or Account that did not pass through, and from, the District Engineer's Office; references being of frequent occurrence, the work operations which were largely carried on extending over the three barriers, and more especially contending with peculiar hardships when there was much sickness in the District, that, notwithstanding all his sufferings from fever which impaired his health that,

---

referred to in [illegible]
of Government, he stated that, whilst
serving in the Central Provinces, his
services

15

appeal. and further said that, as he had declined to go *to* 2nd Barrier as an interpreter, on the occasion of Executive Engineer, Dumagudiem having inquired if he would like, and what pay he would ask for it, he could get no other employment, but that he would not stand in the way of his getting employment, if he (your petitioner), could obtain one in this District, without his knowledge. That, with reference to Executive Engineer's inquiry as regards the interpreter's post, above alluded to, your petitioner stated no objection ; but Mr. Rhind having said it was a temporary one, he informed that Gentleman, that on his visiting the Superintending Engineer as he had been waiting for him all the time, he would go with Major Haig's permission, it being indispensably requisite in his case: and that your petitioner obtaining no conclusive reply with respect to his claim for employment, as explained in the preceding para, was waiting for Superintending Engineer's order, but Major Haig having said as stated above, your petitioner informed him that he was prepared to go for the interpreter's post, if directed, to which he however replied it had been filled up.

17. That your petitioner humbly begs to state that if his act, as regards the contingent money referred to, should have been grappled at all as sufficient cause to proscribe him, ipso facto that it had been committed by him, there is still one prima facie point in reference to which it ought to have been properly weighed, that is that whether he having the said money in a separate box or cash chest, under lock and key, in his charge, took the money from it in such a way as to be considered a theft, or Criminal Misappropriation, or breach of trust ; whether the said money being given him for contingent expenses of the marching establishment, of which he himself constituted one, he could not have possibly been induced to expend some money out of the same, for his own purpose (since he had it in his possession mixed up with his own money under a seperate account) under the peculiar circumstances stated in paras 9 and 10, especially where no help was available while marching on public duty and in the expectation of assets under misapprehension of a previous order, as stated in para, 9, owing to which he was induced to take it in the same way as if one, to whom pay had been due, advanced himself out of the money placed with him, for such purposes.

18. That your petitioner further begs to state that, though he ought to be forgiven for his act which had really occurred under a mistake of fact, and through misapprehension of order, there being every proof as to the facts explained, his case nevertheles met with no consideration as regards his faithful service, but that he should perpetually be deprived of livelihood which he has enjoyed, during the past 20 years, undergoing most trying difficulties his health being almost sacrificed in its discharge ; and that the Government have, even in more serious Criminal cases, generally exercised their equitable patronage in affording relief, where there is the least scope to admit of it, that it may perhaps be more readily proved in case of one dismissed for an offence, which proved indictable, who was nevertheles reinstated in his former post, de facto if there may be a case like it in any public office, in Government Service, on grounds of justice.

19. That the Superintending Engineer being probably of opinion that your petitioner had improperly behaved himself, of which he became but tacitly convinced, he humbly solicits permission to add a few lines, in explanation of it. That your petitioner never rendered an occasion for Major Haig's displeasure in respect to his duty, which may be Evident by his service (vide extract quoted in para 8) of which that gentleman himself is aware that there was never any wilfull delinquency, or neglect of duty except in case of sickness, or other domestic casualties. That should your petitioner have ever committed any fault either in his private, or public conduct since it may be natural to every human being, he should be, first of all, warned of it, especially in respect to intellectual deficiency ; as, otherwise, by its reservation, no person of ordinary understanding ought be able to reform his moral behaviour. And that your petitioner being a nonconformist in his native religion, from his youth, was generally viewed a recusant that, being acquainted with scripture, he[*] shrewdly put on the veil of piety with a view to pleasing his Superiors.

20. That your petitioner humbly begs to state that he never intended to appeal in this case, but there being no alternative but that he should suffer distress for want of livelihood, except he should appeal, the Superintending Engineer having refused to do him any help, notwithstanding the great loss that happened to him in coming back, having claim to employment under the circumstances explained by him, he has however been repugnantly obliged to do it, though previously permitted by Major Haig to appeal. That your petitioner has been without employment from date of his going in August last, after he had been re-instated, and fears that he may eventually lose his claim as the limitation of one year, which is prescribed by general regulations in all such cases, will have expired by August next, within which time he should therefore be re-employed in Government service ; and therefore prays for exemption from the general rule of limitation in his case, should it prove a bar to his past service being counted in continuation, in case he may not succeed in obtaining employment before it is over : and that his service in the Upper Godavery which the Madras Government have sanctioned to be reckoned for pension, vide Proceedings quoted in para 3, may be taken into the favorable consideration of the Chief Commissioner, as he had been on the permanent strength of the Department Public Works, prior to his transfer to the Upper Godavery, as stated in the above Proceedings. That your petitioner further begs to state that, though he had rendered creditable service with respect to the Madras accounts, referred to in para 6, of which Major Haig himself is fully aware, he could obtain no promotion in due course of time owing to which his prospects were reduced ; and his health being

[*] Petitioner means to say that this was the opinion entertained by Major Haig.

though inured to it from frequent attacks, he lost his strength from its inveterate hold (as it occasionally appears on him even at this distance of time) he still endeavoured with unremitting zeal and energy in the discharge of his duties, to the satisfaction of his superiors.

5. That your Petitioner had been a considerable period in the Godavery, Vizagapatam, and Ganjam Districts successively, for about fourteen years, prior to his employment in this District, and obtained testimonials as to his character, copies of which he begs to enclose for your kind perusal and consideration.

6. That your Petitioner, during the period of his service in the Upper Godavery, has rendered faithful service, and invariably performed onerous duties, having settled difficult accounts to the amount of about 14 or 15 lacs of Rupees, for expenditure incurred under the Madras Government prior to the transfer of the works to the Central Provinces, in May 1863. And that the Accounts mentioned, which had previously been in a confused state from the commencement owing to the changes made in the system of the Public Works Accounts in Madras Presidency, the innovation proving, with respect to this District, one of confusion and difficulty, as widely deviating from the course followed in regular Districts, and the new forms and returns introduced requiring much additional work in revision of the old ones, being necessarily prepared, *de novo* in District Engineer's Office, it devolved on your Petitioner as Accountant, to be exposed to the responsibility of undertaking the work which should have properly been done by other Accountants, of the Executive Offices, as every individual Statement and Bill had to be prepared in the District Engineer's Office; and he endeavoured with strenuous exertions in accomplishing the work though a Manager had been specially appointed for settling the Accounts, and notwithstanding all his exertions and responsibility, he cheerfully contented with his pay, and never asked for promotion, or even for an increase of pay.

7. That, on the transfer of the Godavery Works to the Central Provinces, there were many references made by the Controller P. W. A. at Nagpore, calling for explanation with respect to previous Expenditure, Stock, &c., in transferring the same on to the new Accounts; every explanation was rendered by your Petitioner, and the Statements prepared by him were forwarded to the Controller.

8. That, after the transfer of the District from the Madras Presidency, your Petitioner was appointed second Clerk in Superintending Engineer's Office, and also acted for Head Clerk for some time, receiving full salary, viz., Rupees 150 per mensem, *vide* Extract* from the Register of Clerks whose services were dispensed with, this District being amalgamated with the Nagpore Circle, in August 1865; and the said Register bears testimony as to his service, with respect to the Accounts referred to.

---

* Copy enclosed.

9. That your Petitioner humbly begs to state that, during the whole career of his servitude, the past 20 years, there was no fault ever committed by him; but during his late journey on duty, from Dumagudium to the Upper Barriers, he unfortunately, though on the ground of public duty, to enable him to reach his destination, expended some money for his own purpose out of the Contingent Fund which had been given him, solely for the contingent expenses of the marching establishment. That the Superintending Engineer having previously said he might draw his pay at the increased rate, of which Major Haig however forgot subsequently, (or whether he must have misunderstood his verbal order), your Petitioner, thought he might refund the money from the Assets of his pay and batta which would have amounted to more than what had been taken by him, had it been allowed as stated above. That he therefore under that mistake of fact, as stated above, helped himself out of the contingent money in his charge, there being no means of surmounting the difficulties he then had, which would have otherwise prevented him from joining the office. That, moreover, your Petitioner having unfortunately taken his family along with him, during the journey, was obliged to incur much unnecessary expense, and could not wait for orders the Superintending Engineer having gone in advance. And that the money taken by him was duly refunded.

10. That the transaction in question, not having been done with any deliberate intention of guilt, but to overcome difficulty during the journey on public duty, which would have been hindered if he had been detained, your Petitioner's act at that critical time should, therefore, be pardonable, the Law generally providing "there is no guilt, unless there be a guilty intention."

11. That your Petitioner, in belief of pay being due to him, on his mistaken notion of Major Haig's verbal order, as stated above, prepared rough drafts for arrears of pay which he thought had been due, and laid them before the Superintending Engineer for his approval, to be filled in with the amount, in detail, on his sanctioning; but that gentleman forgot about his verbal order alluded to in paragraph9, and passed the Memorandum (original herewith enclosed) number and date as per margin,* reducing him to the grade of 3rd writer. That, in paragraph 2 of the Memo. just referred to above, Major Haig remarks, "he has during the same time attempted by incessant importunity to induce me to give him the post of Head Clerk, or the pay of that post, "or the difference between the pay of that post and his present pay," from which it may be inferred whether your Petitioner, who had never asked before for promotion, or even for an increase of pay when he was engaged in most urgent duty, of the fact of which no other evidence is necessary Major Haig himself being aware, could have been actuated by any other motive than that, he (your Petitioner) having, on one previous occasion, acted for the Head Clerk, on full pay, must have, of course,

* No. 544, dated 20th April 1867.

thought of his claims on account of the service rendered by him (*vide* Extract quoted in paragraph 8) and should have therefore been induced to ask for it. And that, since the case being as stated above, it may be presumed whether your Petitioner could have ventured to ask for Head Clerk's pay when it had been once refused, unless he tried to recover it by repeating his claim, which he could not possibly have preferred so particularly, except on misapprehension of order.

12. That, with reference to the amount taken by your Petitioner referred to in paragraphs 9 and 10, he humbly begs to state that, in like cases, recourse is generally had to the Indian Penal Code, which expressly providing (*vide* section 40) that an offence "denotes a thing made punishable by this Code," it may be construed that, should his act be taken up as an offence, it ought to be in reference thereto, and not otherwise, the Law Maxim being "the express mention of one thing "implies the exclusion of another." That Sections 24 and 25 of the said Code fully explaining, respectively, about "dishonestly" and "fraudulently" his case should be weighed whether it could be treated so, with reference to the one or the other; and further by section 76, it is expressly provided that nothing is an offence which is done by reason of a mistake of fact. That, under these circumstances, the points at issue in the present case would be, referring to its collateral incidents, if properly considered, to ascertain whether your Petitioner had appropriated the money in question, in any way other than as stated in paragraphs 9 and 10; what inducement he might have for it otherwise, and what should be his motive if not as explained therein. That the present case being one of accident and chance, which may be proved, *prima facie*, as explained above in paragraphs 9 and 10, from its nature, your Petitioner, who had acted under such mistake of fact, could not have possibly intended his own betrayal tending to make him liable to punishment; and should therefore be considered innocent. And that it should be further considered whether your Petitioner who had been a period of 20 years in Government service, with his experience, and never committed any such fault, could have acted so with a deliberate intention of guilt; and the Law affording relief where it is opposed to natural justice, on its equitable principles, which example is followed in all trials, in forensic history, even in more serious Criminal cases, it would be widely deviating from the common course of the British Legislature, should your Petitioner whose innocence may be justly proved, *foro conscientiæ*, be made liable for an act for which no guilt should attach to him.

13. That your Petitioner owing to his mind having failed in consequence of his being censured, on account of the drafts prepared by him for his pay (as stated in paragraph 11) being deeply afflicted, as the said drafts were prepared merely for Superintending Engineer's approval, and he did not arbitrarily attempt to draw the increased pay, but on his misapprehension of its having been due, as explained above, applied for leave to go to his native place; which Major Haig however understood in a

different light, that failing to get the Head Clerk's pay, as anticipated, he became discontented, and passed the enclosed Memorandum, number and date as per margin,* dismissing him from office; but the said Memorandum contains no mention as to the cause of his dismissal.

Original No. 569, dated 30th April 1867.

14. That your Petitioner was however subsequently re-employed, and performing his duty; when his family being in a most dangerous state of life, and the Medical Officer having strongly warned him to remove them to the Coast, he was obliged to take leave, it being unavoidable that he should go under the peculiar circumstances he was placed in, at that critical time, and his pay was settled up to the date of his leaving the office; but the leave required being only for a few days, he could not decide as to the period he should take, he asked for it only for taking his family to the Coast, and it was granted.

15. That your petitioner after his arrival in his Native place, became sick, and addressed a petition to the Superintending Engineer stating that, as soon as he could recover health, he would return, praying he would grant him his employment. That your petitioner not having heard in reply, whether he could not obtain his situation, could not have been dissuaded, the Law Maxim being "silence gives consent," and accordingly entertaining full hopes of employment, started about the beginning of December last; but unfortunately met with a dreadful calamity while passing in a boat from Dowlaisweram enroute to Dumagudiem, that the said boat having foundred in the River, he and his family had a narrow escape of death, and hence great delay occurred in reaching Dumagudiem in due time, he having lost his property, owing to which he was detained for upwards a month and fifteen days. And that your petitioner however arrived at Dumagudiem about the 15th of February and having reported his arrival to the Superintending Engineer, has been waiting with the view to asking him for his situation, or in the event of its not being granted, as it has in the meantime been given to another person, for recommending him for employment in one of the Coast Districts, without prejudice to his past service.

16. That, on Superintending Engineer's return from tour, your petitioner applied to him for employment, but Major Haig first said he could not be re-employed expressing his opinion that he had resigned his situation; but on informing him that he did not resign, as, if so, it could not have taken place without a written Application, which in that case ought to be producible, he then said, alluding to the money taken by him, that he had dismissed him. That your petitioner however explained as to the cause of his going after he had been re-employed, as stated in para 14, and that he informed the Superintending Engineer, by petition, that he would return to duty, which he could not possibly have done had he resigned; and further that with reference to his being dismissed, his case ought to be reviewed it's collateral incidents proving his innocence; but Major Haig said that if so, he should

appeal. and further said that, as he had declined to go to 2nd Barrier as an interpreter, on the occasion of Executive Engineer, Dumagudiem having inquired if he would like, and what pay he would ask for it, he could get no other employment, but that he would not stand in the way of his getting employment, if he (your petitioner) could obtain one in this District, without his knowledge. That, with reference to Executive Engineer's inquiry as regards the interpreter's post, above alluded to, your petitioner stated no objection; but Mr. Rhind having said it was a temporary one, he informed that Gentleman, that on his visiting the Superintending Engineer as he had been waiting for him all the time, he would go with Major Haig's permission, it being indispensably requisite in his case: and that your petitioner obtaining no conclusive reply with respect to his claim for employment, as explained in the preceding para, was waiting for Superintending Engineer's order, but Major Haig having said as stated above, your petitioner informed him that he was prepared to go for the interpreter's post, if directed, to which he however replied it had been filled up.

17. That your petitioner humbly begs to state that if his act, as regards the contingent money referred to, should have been grappled at all as sufficient cause to proscribe him, ipso facto that it had been committed by him, there is still one prima facie point in reference to which it ought to have been properly weighed, that is that whether he having the said money in a separate box or cash chest, under lock and key, in his charge, took the money from it in such a way as to be considered a theft, or Criminal Misappropriation, or breach of trust; whether the said money being given him for contingent expenses of the marching establishment, of which he himself constituted one, he could not have possibly been induced to expend some money out of the same, for his own purpose (since he had it in his possession mixed up with his own money under a seperate account) under the peculiar circumstances stated in paras 9 and 10, especially where no help was available while marching on public duty and in the expectation of assets under misapprehension of a previous order, as stated in para, 9, owing to which he was induced to take it in the same way as if one, to whom pay had been due, advanced himself out of the money placed with him, for such purposes.

18. That your petitioner further begs to state that, though he ought to be forgiven for his act which had really occurred under a mistake of fact, and through misapprehension of order, there being every proof as to the facts explained, his case nevertheles met with no consideration as regards his faithful service, but that he should perpetually be deprived of livelihood which he has enjoyed, during the past 20 years, undergoing most trying difficulties his health being almost sacrificed in its discharge; and that the Government have, even in more serious Criminal cases, generally exercised their equitable patronage in affording relief, where there is the least scope to admit of it, that it may perhaps be more readily proved in case of one dismissed for an offence, which proved indictable, who was nevertheles re-

instated in his former post, de facto if there may be a case like it in any public office, in Government Service, on grounds of justice.

19. That the Superintending Engineer being probably of opinion that your petitioner had improperly behaved himself, of which he became but tacitly convinced, he humbly solicits permission to add a few lines, in explanation of it. That your petitioner never rendered an occasion for Major Haig's displeasure in respect to his duty, which may be Evident by his service (vide extract quoted in para 8) of which that gentleman himself is aware that there was never any wilfull delinquency, or neglect of duty except in case of sickness, or other domestic casualties. That should your petitioner have ever committed any fault either in his private, or public conduct since it may be natural to every human being, he should be, first of all, warned of it, especially in respect to intellectual deficiency; as, otherwise, by its reservation, no person of ordinary understanding might be able to reform his moral behaviour. And that your petitioner being a nonconformist in his native religion, from his youth, was generally viewed a recusant that, being acquainted with scripture, he* shrewdly put on the veil of piety with a view to pleasing his Superiors.

20. That your petitioner humbly begs to state that he never intended to appeal in this case, but there being no alternative but that he should suffer distress for want of livelihood, except he should appeal, the Superintending Engineer having refused to do him any help, notwithstanding the great loss that happened to him in coming back, having claim to employment under the circumstances explained by him, he has however been repugnantly obliged to do it, though previously permitted by Major Haig to appeal. That your petitioner has been without employment from date of his going in August last, after he had been re-instated, and fears that he may eventually lose his claim as the limitation of one year, which is prescribed by general regulations in all such cases, will have expired by August next, within which time he should therefore be re-employed in Government service; and therefore prays for exemption from the general rule of limitation in his case, should it prove a bar to his past service being counted in continuation, in case he may not succeed in obtaining employment before it is over: and that his service in the Upper Godavery which the Madras Government have sanctioned to be reckoned for pension, vide Proceedings quoted in para 3, may be taken into the favorable consideration of the Chief Commissioner, as he had been on the permanent strength of the Department Public Works, prior to his transfer to the Upper Godavery, as stated in the above Proceedings. That your petitioner further begs to state that, though he had rendered creditable service with respect to the Madras accounts, referred to in para 6, of which Major Haig himself is fully aware, he could obtain no promotion in due course of time owing to which his prospects were reduced; and his health being

---

* Petitioner means to say that this was the opinion entertained by Major Haig.

much impaired by his sufferings from fever, which consequently made him almost inefficient, his service in this District, though productive of no such advantage to him, as it would be in like cases to any other person, in consideration of his service, ultimately proved to him of great disadvantage, in every respect, to the prejudice of his interest and prospects. That your petitioner having applied for remuneration for settling the accounts referred to, the Superintending Engineer was pleased to say it would be granted; and a special remuneration of 200 rupees being granted to Manager of District Engineer's Office, Lower Godavery District, for settling some accounts to amount of about 2 lacs of rupees, he begs to prefer his claim the accounts settled by him being of more difficult nature, and having cost much more labor, and strenuous exertions. And that your petitioner, in conclusion, humbly prays he may be indemnified for the loss sustained by him, owing to his being dismissed without sufficient cause; and that as he is afraid whether it would perhaps be as revolting in the sight of the Superintending Engineer, by appealing, though he has every claim to his former situation, he prays he may be re-transferred to Madras Presidency, recommended for employment in Revenue or Judicial Department, without prejudice to his past service, in consideration of his faithful service in the Upper Godavery: and for which act of justice, and Philanthropy, your petitioner shall, as in duty bound.

Enl
7615/88

Ever pray
P. BUTCHIAH

DUMAGUDIEM,
29th April 1868.

The reply to this was sent (on reminder dated 30th June 1868) No. 228/2878 dated 16th July 1868

Printed at the Cocanada Printing Press Co.'s Office.

2/3 14/4/88

INDIA
1/16 R.
COURT FEE
ONE ANNA

To
The Honorable,
The Secretary to the Government of Madras
In the Public Works Department,
Fort Saint George.

The humble Memorial
of P. Butchiah Naidu, Pundit,

Sheweth:

That in humble acknowledgment of the orders of Government, No. 576W, dated the 18th February 1888 conveyed in the Proceedings of the Madras* Government, on Office note by the Examiner Public Works Accounts, dated the 13th February 1888, No. 1062, memorialist humbly begs to represent, (while submitting his+ application for pension through the Government of Central Provinces, as directed in the above G.O.) that in para 8 of his petition dated the 19th December 1887 referred to in the above Proceedings of Government, he stated that, whilst serving in the Central Provinces, his services

+ despatched per today's mail.

19th

services had been summarily dispensed with; and that on appealing then to that Government he was pronounced as not disqualified from Government Employ, as per* decision passed in his case, letter No. 228/2878, dated 16th July 1868, from the Public Works Secretary to Chief Commissioner, Central Provinces.— From this decision will be passed that Memorialist's services were summarily dispensed with by the then Superintending Engineer, under whom he had been serving at the time; and not by the Government of Central Provinces as would appear in the context of the Government Orders, in the above Proceedings, to have been so deduced from what is stated in his petition aforesaid.

*copy already submitted as Exhibit C., annexed to the above petition.

2. That Memorialist would here beg to represent that his case (from it's nature

nature a most pitiable one, as so unique and singularly unprecedented under the Government administration) having primarily been decided about, and Orders passed on it by the Government of Central Provinces, pronouncing him as not disqualified from Government Employ, as just explained above; he, for fear of prolixity, refrained from explaining in his petition of the 19th December 1887, already referred to, the cause of his services being summarily dispensed with,— as whether it might perhaps appear superfluous to enter into an uncalled-for latitude of detail, for recapitulating now the incidents of his case already once decided about on his appeal to the Government of Central Provinces, as per Orders passed by that Government, as

explained

explained before.

3. That, Memorialist also submitted with the foregoing petition of the 19th December 1887, just referred to above; Copy of the Orders of Government of India, No. 669 G., dated 12th March 1880, as Exhibit marked D., ratifying the Local Government's decision aforesaid.

4. That, however, to obviate any further references about his case, Memorialist humbly begs to submit the accompanying printed Copy of his petition of appeal, to the Government of Central Provinces by which the injustice done in his case will be plainly seen; and upon which the aforesaid decision pronouncing him as not disqualified from Government Employ has been passed by that Government.

5. That, the above printed Copy of his original petition of appeal fully explaining the collateral incidents of his case; and as there is nothing more to be added, Memorialist would humbly beg to state that, though his appointment, as the Head Accountant Upper Godavery, had been specially sanctioned by Government, in G.O. No. 1040+, of 4th June 1861, on recommendation of the then Chief Engineer; and though prior to taking up the said appointment, Memorialist had been on the permanent strength of the Public Works Department, as will be seen from the Proceedings of the Madras Government, No. 783+, dated the 22nd May 1861, (Copy submitted with his petition of the

+ para 2.

+ para 4.

10th

19th December 1887, above referred to) his services were nevertheless summarily dispensed with, his prospects of further advancement in the Department thereby greatly invaded to no little detriment of his vital interests, as he would have, otherwise, been in continued service, now upwards forty years standing.–

6. That, the above printed copy of his foregoing petition of appeal, paras 4 to 7, fully explains about the services rendered by him; and in the concluding para 20, Memorialist particularly urged about his claim, referring to the Orders of the Madras Government specially sanctioning his services for pension, for reasons stated by the Chief Engineer in the Government Proceedings just cited above, and prayed to be indemnified for the great loss happened to him on account of the injustice done in his case, under the circumstances explained by him: whereupon the aforesaid decision pronouncing him as not disqualified from Government employ has been passed by the Local Government; and that same decision subsequently ratified by the Government of India, as explained before.

7. That, as his petition of the 19th December 1887 already referred to, fully explains about the great injustice done in his case, by which he became entirely ruined, his whole family rendered so desperately forlorn their prosperity and well being completely invaded

by

by it. Memorialist humbly begs to conclude this, throwing himself at the mercy of the Generous Government for doing Justice, by endowing him with the pension due to him under the special sanction of the Madras Government for the services rendered by him; sacrificing his health and strength in the faithful discharge of his duties. and, as in duty bound, shall ever pray. -

Ganjam District }
Berhampore. }
The 25th. July 1888. }

P. Butchiah Naidu
Pundit

B. No 647 W. d/ 23. 2. 88
" 576 W. " 18. 2. 88
No 127 C. " 10. 1. 88
G. O. 391. " 21. 2. 1860
" 1040. " 4. 6. 61
" 832. " 23. 4. 60.

18-12-11 B II

P. W. C. No 7615

(4)

With one Enclosure

G. 1

Recd 2-8-88

B No 2473 Wd/14 August 1888

2417, 2418, 2419
2420, ~~2421~~, 2425
2426, 2427, 2428, 2429
9-8-1888
Sanitary

Petitioner is informed that any appeal he may desire to make on the subject of his dismissal or pension must be addressed to the Govt of the Central Provinces

8/8/88

To
The Petitioner

15/8

6. 7. 8. 88

13. 8. 88

No. 558

BELLARY DISTRICT BOARD OFFICE.

Dated { 22d June 1888.

Municipal De
CURRENT No

From,
H. St. A. Goodrich Esquire
~~THE~~ COLLECTOR AND PRESIDENT DISTRICT BOARD,
BELLARY.

To,
THE ~~UNDER~~ Chief SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT,
Local & Municipal ~~FINANCIAL~~ DEPARTMENT,
MADRAS.

Sir,

With reference to G. O. dated 4th June 88 + not cmd May 1888, No 1025 L, I have the honour to request you will be good enough to move Government to favour me with a copy of each of the types of designs of bridges, on their receipt from England.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servt
H Goodrich
President.

10256
4-6-88

G.O. No 1387 W of 11-5-88.

Memo

In the despatch printed with G.O. No 1387 W of 11 May 1888, the Home Govt intimated that 25 copies of each of the type designs & specifications of bridges will be forwarded to this Govt. As this number will probably be insufficient for distribution to Dist Boards & the P.W. Dept, the Local & Munl Dept will be requested to ascertain & report the number of copies required by that Dept

9.7.88

L & M Dept

No 587

9.7.88

P.W.C. No 6593

LOCAL FUND DEPARTMENT,
Local & Municipal Dept
BELLARY DISTRICT BOARD OFFICE.
CURRENT No.

Dated 22d June 1888 No. 558

(9)

To, Chief
The ~~Under~~ Secretary
to Government,
Local & ~~Financial~~ Municipal Dept.,
MADRAS.

Enclosure.

Received 23-6-88
No. 396 D of 11th July 1888
R. 6: 7: 88

Subject

Requesting the favour of a supply of copies of designs of bridges -

No. 546
Transferred to the Public Works Department
(By order)
Assistant Secretary

3/July

19
28/6/88
Madras
5th July 1888

To The Public Works Department

No 6593

(9)

In the despatch printed with G.O. No 1387 W of 11.5.88, it is intimated that 25 copies of each of the type designs & specifications for bridges will be sent to this country. This will be a very small no. for distribution to Dist. Boards & supply Engrs. It is proposed therefore to ask the L & M. Dept to report the no. of copies required for distribution - to this can be added the no. required for the P.W.D., & the India Office can be asked to supply addl copies.

9.7.88

Approved
10/7/88

No. 396 D

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
Ootacamund, 11th July 1888.

OFFICE NOTE.

From The Public Works Secretary

The Chief Secretary
Local and Municipal Dept.

Adverting to G.O. 1387 W of 11 May 1888, will you please let me know the number of type designs of bridge works that will be required by the Local and Municipal Dept - It is proposed to ask the Secretary of State to send out a sufficient number for both the P.W. Dept and Local Boards -

(Signed) J O Hasted Col RE
Secy to Govt P.W. Dept

10256
4-6-88

G.O. No 1387 W of 11-5-88.

P.W.C. No 6593

LOCAL FUND DEPARTMENT.
Local & Municipal Dept

Memo

In the despatch forwarded with G.O. No 1387 W of 11 May 1888, the Home Govt intimated that 25 copies of each of the type designs & specifications of bridges will be forwarded to this Govt. As this number will probably be insufficient for distribution to Dist. Boards & the P.W. Dept, the Local & Muncl Dept will be requested to ascertain & report the number of copies required by that Dept.

9.7.88

L. & M. Dept

No. 396 D

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
Ootacamund, 11th July 1888.

OFFICE NOTE.

From The Public Works Secretary

To The Chief Secretary
Local and Municipal Dept.

Adverting to G.O. 1387 W of 11 May 1888, will you please let me know the number of type designs &c of bridge works that will be required by the Local and Municipal Dept. It is proposed to ask the Secretary of State to send out a sufficient number for both the P. W. Dept and Local Boards.

(Signed) J. O. Hasted Col. R.E.
Secy to Govt P. W. Dept

No. 1387 W d/. 11-5-88

No 396 D/. 11th July 1888

Desp d: 12 VII/88.

Nilgiri District Board office
Ootacamund 10th July 1888

No. 650

Local & Municipal
CURRENT No. 2293

From.

L. R. Barrows Esq
President District Board

To

The Chief Secretary to Government
Local and Municipal Dept.
Madras.

Sir

With reference to G.O No. 1025 L. dated 4th June 1888 Communicating G.O. No. 1387/W. dated 11th May 1888, I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to furnish me with a set of type drawings as per accompanying list as the District Board Engineer says that they will be useful in the District.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedient Servt

For President

Su2
75-21/88

Memo of type drawings of Road way Bridges required

Particulars	No.
Bridges rising by increments of 5 feet from 20 feet to 30 feet clear Span, with 9 feet clear Roadway	3
— Do — Do — with 14 feet clear Roadway	3
Bridges rising by increments of 10 feet from 40 feet to 80 feet Span centres bearings with 14 feet clear Road way	5

For
President

Encl
7521/88

Enc to Letter No 650 d/10. 7. 88

C325–8

ENT.

and

M. ~~10~~ 286
4-6-88

No 396 D. 11. 7. 88
B. No 2328 W. 31. 7. 88
G.O. 1387 W. 11. 5. 88
" 1523 W. 16. 6. 86
" 269 W. 1. 2. 86

(2)

P.W.C. No 7751

Local & Municipal Dept.
CURRENT No. 2293 L M

From

The President Dt. Board
Nilgiris

To

The Chief Secretary to Govt.
L. & M. Dept.
Madras

No 650

Dated 10th }
Despd 12th } July 1888
Received 14th
Recd 31-7-88

Enc 2

Nos. 2474 / 2475 w.d/14 – 8 – 1888

Subject

Requesting to be furnished with a set of type drawings for the use of Dt. Board Engineer

No 631

Transferred to the Public Works Department

(By Order)

W. S. Lindsay
Asst. Secretary

V.R.
14/7/88

Madras
30th July/88

O. 8. 8. 88 R. 11. 8. 88

P.W.C. No 7751

CHIEF SECRETARIAT,

~~Ootacamund,~~ Madras 1st August 88.

OFFICE NOTE.

Recd 7-8-88.

From

THE CHIEF SECRETARY,
Local & Munl. Department.

To

The Secretary to Govt. Public Works Department.

Nos. 2474 / 2475 w.d/14–8–1888

Vide your Office Note dated 11th July/88 No. 396 D.

One hundred and fifty copies of each of the designs and Specifications will be required for this Department as shown below:-

21 District Boards at 6 copies each	126
President, Munl. Commission Madras	4
To be kept in reserve in this Dept.	20
Total	150

H. Davidson
Under Secy. to Govt. P.W.D.
for Ag. Chief Secy.

S.A.W.

Please [illegible] number [illegible] for P.W. Dept.
3-viii-88

O. 11. 4. 8 / 11. 38th / C. 8. 8. 88

24746

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 14th August 1888

READ the following

H.E. No. 558 d/ 22nd June 1888.

" No. 650 d/ 10 July 1888.

" No. – d/ 1 August 1888.

Application will be made to the India Office for additional copies of the type designs and specifications.

H.E. No. 2475 w.d/ 14 August 1888

To

The Director Genl. of Stores
India Office
London.

Sir,

With reference to despatch from the Secy. of State for India No. 2 Public Works (Stores) d/ 12th April 1888, I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of 25 copies of each of the twenty three type designs and

No. 10 256
4-6-88

No 396 D. 11. 7. 88
B. No 2328 W. 31. 7. 88
G.O. 1387 W. 11. 5. 88
" 1523 W. 16. 6. 86
" 269 W. 1. 2. 86

O. 8. 8. 88 R. 14. 8. 88

No. 396 D d/. 11-7-88

O.S. 4/8/88 | M 3.8.88

No. 24746

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 14th August 1888

READ the following

From the Collector and President District Board, Bellary —— A.E. No. 558 d/ 22d June 1888.

From the President, District Board, Nilgiris —— " No. 650 d/ 10 July 1888.

From the Chief Secy. Local and Munl. Deptt. —— " No. – d/ 1 August 1888.

Application will be made to the India Office for additional copies of the type designs and specifications.

A.E. No. 1475 W d/. 14th August 1888

To
The Director Genl: of Stores
India Office
London.

Sir,

With reference to despatch from the Secy: of State for India No. 2 Public Works (Stores) d/ 12th April 1888, I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of 25 copies of each of the twenty three type designs and

107

and specifications for bridge superstructures, and to request that 225 additional copies of each may be supplied to this Government for distribution as per margin.

2. It is considered desirable that copies should be available for reference in every Executive Engineer's Office, and each District Board in the Presidency requires six or more copies.

I have &c.

11/8/88

18/8

Id 23/8

55. VIII

12. VIII. 88.

10. 8. 88

(2)

For distribution to District Boards	150 Copies
For distribution to Officers of the P. W. Deptt	100 "
Total	250
Already received	25 "
Number still required	225 Copies

No. 2474 } dated 14th August 1888
2475 }

14/8

No 2013 of 4·8·88

GOVERNMENT CAN SANCTION THE GRANT OF COMPENSATION IN LIEU OF QUARTERS TO THE APOTHECARIES FOR THE PERIODS IN QUESTION, AS RECOMMENDED BY THE MILITARY DEPARTMENT BUT, UNDER P.W.D. CODE PARA 1136, THEY SHOULD HAVE APPLIED FOR QUARTERS.

C.

4/8

4/8

No. 2476 dated 14th August 1888

B

The grant to the two ~~apothecaries~~ of compensation in lieu of quarters for the periods in question to sanctioned

tioned

8/8/88

18/8

11. 8. 88

43 VIII 88

17. 8. 88.

101

26 JUL 1888
ENCLOSURES
P.W. AC NTS

Ootacamund
18th July 1888

No 4915

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
19 JUL 88
P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS

Transferred to the Public Works Department, for favorable consideration, with the remark that the Government in the Mily Dept. concur in the view taken by H.E. the Commander-in-Chief.

(By Order)

A Kenney Herbert Br Genl
Secy to Govt
Mily Dept.

o.W.S 103:7
m 19:7

Mily {1888}

(2) No: 5

From

The offg. Qr. Mr. Genl

To

The Secy to Govt
M. D.

Dated 16th } July.
Recd 17th }
Recd 21-7-88
No. 2534.A.

one
Enclos. Nil.

No. 2476 d/14 August 1888

Subject.

Rel. to a claim for compensation in lieu of quarters for certain Medical Warrant Officers in Madras while on sick leave

No. 2780C d/ 23rd July 1888

To
C

For favour of remarks.

J.W.
19/7/88

W.

with Endorsement

Qr. Mr. Genl's office.
Ootacamund 16th July 1888.

No. 2534.A.

From,

Col. M. Protheroe, C.B. C.S.I.,
Offg. Quarter Master Genl.

To

The Secretary to Government.
Military Department.

Sir,

In submitting the following cases in connection with claims of two Assistant Apothecaries for compensation in lieu of Quarters, for the favorable consideration of Government, I am desired to say that under the circumstances His Excellency the Commander in Chief recommends the grant of the compensation applied for in each case for the periods intervening between the arrival of the Warrant Medical Officers in Madras and the grant to them of sick leave.

I. Assistant Apothecary H. H. D. Lynsdale was ordered by the Surgeon General Her Majesty's Forces to Madras from Vizagapatam to appear before the Medical Board, he arrived at Madras

on

on the 25th November 1887 and after remaining under treatment in the interval was brought before a Board and recommended for 6 months sick leave on the 15th December 1887.

II. Assistant Apothecary R.W. Small arrived on duty in Madras from Rangoon on the 20th January 1888 and should have returned to Rangoon on completion of his duty, but, on the 23rd idem he reported sick and was brought before a Medical Board and recommended 6 months sick leave on the 1st March 1888.

2. In the absence of any definite ruling on the subject the Superintending Engineer declines to admit the claim for compensation in lieu of quarters for these Warrant Officers for the periods they were on the sick list in Madras before being recommended for sick leave by Medical Boards; but it seems reasonable that these periods which were not periods of leave, should be looked on as having been passed on duty during which free

free quarters or compensation in lieu thereof is admissible.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your obedt. Servant,

M Protheroe Colonel,
Offg. Qr. Mr. General

N.B. S.S.C. will be required.

EXAMINER
No. ______
25 JUL 1888
ENCLOSURES
P. W. ACCOUNTS

Encl
7194/88
7740/88

P.W. Department
Proceedings of the Madras Govt.
Read the following

Court of Wards, 25th April 1888, No. 840.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COURT OF WARDS.

The Hon. W. S. Whiteside.

Read—the following memorandum from Captain W. L. C. BADDELEY, R.E., Under Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, to the Court of Wards (through the Revenue Department), dated Chepák, 6th April 1888, No. 1480-C:—

	RS.
Works	2,87,400
Cost of Public Works supervision at 23 per cent. on Rs. 2,87,400.	66,100
Total ...	3,53,500

The accompanying statement compiled from the budget estimates received from Superintending Engineers for estate works proposed to be carried out by the Public Works Department during 1888-89 (fasli 1298) is forwarded to the Court of Wards (through the Revenue Department) with the request that a sum of Rs. 3,53,500, as shown in the margin, may be placed at the disposal of the Public Works Department as early as practicable.

ENCLOSURE No. 1.

BUDGET estimate of works proposed to be carried out by the Public Works Department in the estates under the Court of Wards during the year 1888-89.

Division.	Estimate.	Locality.	Item number.	Particulars.	Amount of estimate.	OUTLAY.		GRANT, 1888-89.		Item No.	Remarks and references.
						Actual to end of 1886-87.	Probable during 1887-88.	Amount.	Total.		
				BUILDINGS.				RS.	RS.		
Ganjam ..	Parlákimedi ..	..	..	Original works	..	..	..	8,000	8,000	..	
	Urlám ..	..	..	Constructing halting shed for Native officers ..	..	..	..	800		..	
	Do. ..	..	..	Constructing a shed for granaries	..	..	..	1,000		..	
	Do. ..	..	..	Sundry works	..	..	..	200	2,000	..	
	Jarada ..	..	..	Improvements to the palace buildings	..	..	..	750	750	..	
	Chinna Kimedi.	..	..	Original works	..	..	..	3,000	3,000	..	
	Dhárákót ..	..	..	Do.	..	..	..	1,000	1,000	..	
	Bodagada ..	..	..	Do.	..	..	..	1,000	1,000	..	
	Kurla ..	..	..	Do.	..	..	..	200	200	..	
	Aska ..	..	..	Do.	..	..	..	200	200	..	
				Ain (The funds or revenue proper of the estate).							
Ramnad ..	Ramnad ..	Kannagudy.	..	Constructing a granary	..	..	..	1,000	..	..	Sanctioned by the Court of Wards in Proceedings, dated 26th July 1887, No. 1052.
	Do. ..	Rajasingamangalam.	..	Do. do.	3,070	..	570	2,500	..	..	
	Do. ..	Kamancottai	..	Do. do.	..	..	..	1,000	..	..	
	Do. ..	Pogalore ..	..	Do. do.	..	..	..	1,500	..	..	
	Do. ..	..	..	Minor works	..	..	..	200	..	..	
				Devastanam (Temple Endowment Fund).							
	Do. ..	Theruppanavasal.	..	Constructing a mandapam	..	..	..	2,000	..	..	
	Do. ..	Tirushuli ..	..	Constructing a mandapam in front of Ummen Covil of Tirushuli temple.	2,140	..	1,140	1,000	9,200	..	Sanctioned by Court of Wards in No. 1130, dated 6th August 1887.
				Total, Civil Buildings ..	..	..	..	..	25,350	..	
				Communications.							
Ganjam	Parlákimedi.	..	..	Original works	..	..	.	10,000	10,000	..	
	Urlám ..	..	..	Constructing Mobagam road	..	..	..	4,000	4,000	..	
	Jarada ..	..	..	Constructing Jarada-Kanchili road	..	..	..	5,000	5,000		
				Total, Communications ..	..	..	..	..	19,000		
				IRRIGATION.							
	Parlákimedi.	..	..	Original works	..	..	..	35,000	35,000		
	Urlám ..	..	..	Constructing new head sluice to Mobagam channel..	..	..	..	5,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Constructing head sluices at the heads of Potayavalasa, Devadi, Gopallapenta Madapam, Makivalasa, &c., branch channels.	..	..	..	1,500			
	Do. ..	..	..	Constructing regulators across Mabagam, &c. ..	..	..	..	500			
	Do. ..	..	..	Constructing tank opposite to Urlám bungalow, with regulating sluice.	..	..	..	1,000	8,000		
	Jarada ..	..	..	Constructing sluices, weirs, &c., for the 14 tanks ..	..	..	..	1,000	1,000		
	Chinna Kimedi	..	..	Original works	..	..	..	5,000	5,000		
	Dhárákót ..	..	..	Do.	..	..	..	2,000	2,000		
	Bodagada ..	..	..	Do.	..	..	..	1,000	1,000		
	Kurla ..	..	..	Do.	..	..	..	200	200		
	Aska ..	..	..	Do.	..	..	..	200	200		
Coimbatore ..	Erumaipati ..	..	..	Raising the bund and repairing the sluice of Kanakarampatti tank.	..	..	..	500	500		
Salem District.				*Ain (The funds or revenue proper of the estate).*							
Ramnad ..	Ramnad ..	..	..	Improvements to the Salagramam tank	..	..	..	2,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Arunuthimangalam tank ..	..	..	..	1,500			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Pottavayal tank	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Muthuvadu tank	..	..	..	2,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Rettayalam tank	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Karkamalam tank	..	..	..	2,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Kamancottai tank	..	..	1,500	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Kallicottai tank	..	..	..	1,500			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Cavanore tank	..	..	..	1,200			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Akramasy tank	..	..	..	2,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Thathangal tank	..	..	..	1,500			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Mela and Keela Selvanore tank and channel.	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Sickal tank and channel ..	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Vendony tank	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Ragunatha-Cauvery channel in Mutukulatúr limits.	..	..	..	2,250			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Manjore tank	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Kodumalur tank	..	..	..	2,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Ragunatha-Cauvery in Kamuthy limits.	..	..	..	4,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Do. do. Narayana-Cauvery	..	..	..	5,250			

Budget estimate of works proposed to be carried out by the Public Works Department in the estates under the Court of Wards during the year 1888-89—*cont.*

Divisions.	Estate.	Locality.	Item number.	Particulars.	Amount of estimate.	OUTLAY.		GRANT, 1888-89.		Item number.	Remarks and references.
						Actual to end of 1886-87.	Probable during 1887-88.	Amount.	Total.		
				IRRIGATION—*cont.*				RS.	RS.		
				Ain (The funds or revenue proper of the estate—cont.)							
Ramnad.	Ramnad ..	..	..	Minor new works	..	..	..	4,150			
	Do. ..	..	..	Grants to complete major works of 1887-88 ..	..	..	..	5,650			
				Devastanam (Temple Endowment Funds).							
	Do. ..	..	..	Thalayadikottai tank	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Paranur tank	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Athiyore do.	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Vilanore do.	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Collanore do.	..	..	..	1,100			
	Do. ..	..	..	Theravaly do.	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Maranthay do.	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Therumalangantha cottai tank	..	..	..	1,200			
	Do. ..	..	..	Tirushuli tank	..	..	..	1,700			
				Chattram (Charitable Endowment Fund).							
	Do. ..	..	..	Kodikolum tank	..	..	..	1,000			
	Do. ..	..	..	Vellah do.	..	..	..	1,450			
	Do. ..	..	..	Thoppur do.	..	..	..	1,000	57,450		
				Total, Irrigation ..	..	..	..	..	1,10,350		

ENCLOSURE No. 2.

Repairs.

Executive division.	Name of estate.	Item number.	Projects.	Amount.	Total.	Item number.
			BUILDINGS. *Repairs.*	RS.	RS.	
Ganjam ..	Parlákimedi ..	..	Repairs	5,000	5,000	..
Do. ..	Urlám ..	..	Repairing minor's quarters at Urlám ..	1,000		..
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Do. choultry and building at Devadi ..	1,000	2,000	..
Do. ..	Jarada ..	..	Repairs to Palace buildings	750	750	..
Do. ..	Chinna Kimedi.	..	Repairs	2,000	2,000	..
Do. ..	Dhárákót ..	..	Do.	500	500	..
Do. ..	Bodagada ..	..	Do.	500	500	..
Do. ..	Kurla	..	Do.	300	300	..
Do. ..	Aska	..	Do.	300	300	..
Do. ..	Chakipalli ..	..	Do.	600	600	..
Do. ..	Tarlapeta ..	..	Do.	600	600	..
			Ain (the funds or revenue proper of the estate).			
Ramnad ..	Ramnád ..	..	Annual and special repairs	7,500		..
			Devastanam (Temple Endowment Funds).			
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Annual and special repairs	13,500		..
			Chattram (Charitable Endowment Funds).			
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Annual and special repairs	9,000	30,000	..
			Total, Buildings ..	..	42,550	
			COMMUNICATIONS. *Repairs.*			
Ganjam ..	Parlákimedi ..	..	Repairs	12,000	12,000	..
Do. ..	Urlám ..	..	Repairing Urlám road and village roads ..	700	700	..
Do. ..	Jarada ..	..	Do. the portion of the Jarada-Kanchili roads	500	500	..
			Total, Communications ..	..	13,200	
			IRRIGATION. *Repairs.*			
Do. ..	Parlákimedi ..	..	Repairs	5,000	5,000	..
Do. ..	Urlám ..	..	Repairing Mohagam main channel	500		..
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Do. Potayavalsa, Devadi, Gopalapenta, Mohagam Makivalsa branch channels ..	1,000		..
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Repairing Gopalapenta tank	500		..
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Do. Chódavaram branch channel ..	400		..
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Do. Urlám branch channel	600	3,000	..
Do. ..	Jarada ..	..	Earth-work and other repairs to 14 tanks ..	3,000	3,000	..
Do. ..	Chinna Kimedi.	..	Repairs	5,000	5,000	..
Do. ..	Dhárákót ..	..	Do.	2,500	2,500	..
Do. ..	Bodagada ..	..	Do.	1,500	1,500	..
Do. ..	Kurla ..	..	Do.	300	300	..
Do. ..	Aska ..	..	Do.	300	300	..
Godávari, Western	Lakkavaram ..	..	Repairing Kongara tank	1,800		..
Do.	Do. ..	..	Do. Raju do.	560		..
Do.	Do. ..	..	Do. Pedda do.	300		..
Do.	Do. ..	..	Unforeseen requirements	340	3,000	..
			Ain (the funds or revenue proper of the estate).			
Ramnad ..	Ramnad ..	..	Special repairs	43,050		..
			Devastanam (Temple Endowment Fund).			
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Spacial repairs	7,600		..
			Chattram (Charitable Endowment Fund).			
Do. ..	Do. ..	..	Special repairs	2,700	53,350	..
			Total, Irrigation ..	..	76,950	

ENCLOSURE No. 3.

ABSTRACT of the amounts required during 1888-89 (fasli 1298) for works proposed to be carried out by the Public Works Department in the estates under the Court of Wards.

Executive division.	Name of estate.	ORIGINAL WORKS.				REPAIRS.				Grand Total.
		Buildings.	Communications.	Irrigation.	Total.	Buildings.	Communications.	Irrigation.	Total.	
		RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.	RS.
Ganjam ..	Parlákimedi ..	8,000	10,000	35,000	53,000	5,000	12,000	5,000	22,000	75,000
Do. ..	Urlám	2,000	4,000	8,000	14,000	2,000	700	3,000	5,700	19,700
Do. ..	Jarada	750	5,000	1,000	6,750	750	500	3,000	4,250	11,000
Do. ..	Chinna Kimedi ..	3,000	..	5,000	8,000	2,000	..	5,000	7,000	15,000
Do. ..	Dhárákót ..	1,000	..	2,000	3,000	500	..	2,500	3,000	6,000
Do. ..	Bodagada ..	1,000	..	1,000	2,000	500	..	1,500	2,000	4,000
Do. ..	Kurla	200	..	200	400	300	..	300	600	1,000
Do. ..	Aska	200	..	200	400	300	..	300	600	1,000
Do. ..	Chakipalli ..	..	..	..	..	600	..	..	600	600
Do. ..	Tarlapeta ..	..	..	..	..	600	..	..	600	600
Godávari, Western	Lakkavaram ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3,000	3,000	3,000
Coimbatore ..	Erumaipati ..	..	..	500	500	..	..	..	..	500
Ramnad ..	Ramnad ..	9,200	..	57,450	66,650	30,000	..	53,350	83,350	1,50,000
	Total ..	25,350	19,000	1,10,350	1,54,700	42,550	13,200	76,950	1,32,700	2,87,400

Mis. G.O., No. 2239.

Forwarded to the Court of Wards.

OOTACAMUND,
14th April 1888.

(Signed) J. F. PRICE,
Secretary to Government.

RESOLUTION—dated 25th April 1888, No. 840.

Communicated to the Collectors of Ganjam, Godávari, Madura and Salem, with the request that they will make the necessary provision, as usual, in the budgets for fasli 1298. The provision should include cost of supervision at 23 per cent. on the outlay.

2. They are also requested to report whether any of the works entered in the statement are such as ought properly to be executed by the District Board out of their own funds, instead of from the funds of the estate, as proposed—*vide* paragraph 6 of Court's Proceedings, dated 17th March 1888, No. 553.

3. The budgets are due on the 10th proximo, and the Court trust that they will be submitted punctually.

(True Copies and Extract.)

(Signed) H. A. SIM,
Acting Secretary.

To the Collector of Ganjam.
" " of Godávari.
" " of Madura.
" " of Salem.

Copy to the Secretary to Government, Public Works Department, through the Secretary to Government, Revenue Department.
" " Accountant-General.

Exd. W. J. Lewis.

Order thereon. No. 1544 W
d/ 25th May 1888
Communicated to the
officers concerned.

(True Extract)
W L C Baddeley Capt R.E.
Under Secy to Govt
P.W.D.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

1888.

Court of Wards,

MADRAS.

Printed May 10th.

Proceedings, 25*th April* 1888, *No.* 840.

Communicating, with instructions, to the Collectors concerned Government Order, Revenue Department, communicating Proceedings of the Public Works Department forwarding budget estimate of works proposed to be carried out by the Public Works Department during 1888-89.

[illegible]
Supg Engr V Circle

---

disposal of this Department.

(By order)

(Sd) W. L. C. Baddeley
Capt R. E.
Under Secy. to Govt P. W. D.

3/7

No. 1544 W d/ 25-5-88

1888.

P. W. DEPARTMENT

Current No. 6209

From

The Supdg. Engineer
IV circle

Enclos.—

No. 260/E.W.

Dated 25th June 1888

Received 27 — do —

SUBJECT.

Requesting an allotment of Rs 263 for Erumapatti Estate works sanctioned for execution during 1888-89.

DISPOSAL.

No. 2476 C Dated 2nd July 1888

Forwarded to the Court of Wards, through the Revenue Department, with a request that an additional grant of Rs 263, or Rs 323 inclusive of Establishment charges, may be placed at the

---

Proceedings of the Court of Wards.

Dated 24 July 1888.

No. 1617.

H. S. Thomas Esq. F.L.S.; F.Z.S.

READ

Endorsement of the Secretary to Govt. R.D. dated 12th July '88 Mis No. 4073 on G.O. P.W.D. d 2nd July '88 No. 2476 C.

Resolution

An additional allotment of Rs 323 is sanctioned.

(True Extract)

Ag. Secretary.

To,
The P.W.D. thro' Govt. R.D.
The Cllr of Salem.