

No 506D. 13. 8. 88.

PWC No 8922

No 626, P.R

Submitted to the
Chief Engineer Public
Works Department with
reference to his No 506D
of 13th August/88

From,

The Supg Engineer
Panigar Project

To,

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D

No 626, P.R

Dated 1st September 1888

19. 9. 88

21

No. 2924 Wd/18th September
1888

Col. R.

Supg Engineer
Panigar Project

1. 9. 88

No. 2924 Wd/18th September
1888

Horse allowance

at the rate of Rupees 16,
per mensem, the actual
cost, may be passed to
Sergeant Cherry during
his stay on the plains.

See
10/9/88

SE Panigar Project
Exp. Receipts
19/9
12/88

Reports that the
actual cost to Sergeant
J. Cherry of the keep
of his horse at Ma-
dura is Rs 16 per
mensem.

With order

(13)
Enc 89024

For

For orders whether
any further action
need be taken.

The S.S. seem
dissatisfied that the
lime was used up
on the work.

Cy
6. 9. 88

The lime ought not to have
been charged off to the work.
It is now impossible to
know whether the lime was
ever returned up by the
Contractor, but my opinion
is that both Mr. Allen &
the Contractor acted in good
faith; but as soon as it
was found that the lime
was of bad quality Mr. Pagan
ought to have reported the
matter. In any case the
fact must have done the
value of the lime if it
perished while in their

provision, and the amount
should now be written
off to profit & loss.

Wm
7.9.50

D.W.

The loss must apparently
be charged to the work.

What the Bar questions
apparently is the authority
of the Supply Bar to dispose
of the matter as he did
without reference to
higher authority.

under para 1911
of the Code. the loss
cannot apparently
be written off to profit

loss.
An order might
perhaps be written
in the terms of your
note, winding up
with sanction to
charging off
the loss to the
work.

Cu
7.9.50

Wm - Assuming that the same can
be collected for this particular work. Therefore
it must be charged to it - para 1911

6.8.9.88 2.16.9.88