

Read Cases 5992, 7246
9228, 8226
4629

SCA 16-9-88
LFC 27-8-88
SCA 25-6-88
HWS 1928W 20-8-88

No 3146 W dated 8th October/88
 1928 W 20.5.85

Ex: 5

R/25.9.88

the outlay 7 Rs 167³

The outlay of Rs. 1673
incurred in excess of the sanc-
tioned estimate for the Sub-
magistrate's office at Pithapuram
in the Godavari District, is
sanctioned.

2. The Examiner's Office
note No 2293 of 26th September
1888 will be communicated
to the Suptg Engineer for
attention

2.10.55

Lee

4/10/88

pen
8/10/88

7

The Supt. Eng^r of Circles

with completion report

Examiner P. W. Accounts

$\frac{\sigma}{2/10}$ R. 6. 10. 88. $\frac{\sigma}{2/10}$ R. 6. 10. 88. $\frac{\sigma}{2/10}$ R. 6. 10. 88.

FROM,

EXAM
No. 713 G.D.
J. Le Saul Esqre
Executive
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER in charge

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWARAM, 14th June 1885

SIR,

1928W
I have the honor to inform you that an excess outlay Rs. 1672-13-1 has been incurred on the estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 1298 W of 20/8/85 for "Constructing a Sub Magistrates Catcherry at Pittapuram" in the Godavari Eastern Division. The reasons for this excess outlay, the Executive Engineer states are as follow:-

- (1) Concrete in foundations has been laid a little thicker than anticipated owing to the uneven ground, the rate provided in the estimate was inadequate
- (2) The rate provided for brick in Chumam in foundations was

insufficient

- (3) No provision was made in the estimate for building up the spaces between rafters which was carried out.
- (4) Omission of Couples for latrine & Cook room from the estimate.
- (5) On account of insufficient provision in the estimate for petty supervision as the work was in progress for about 3 years; a Maistry, a Gunasta, & a watchman had to be maintained during that period.
- (6) Plastering & whitewashing & other petty works, and partly for wooding and Bamboo rattling for which nothing was provided for in the estimate.

2. Under the reasons above given, I request you will be good enough to obtain the sanction of Government to the excess outlay above referred to in order to remove the Examiner's objection.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servant

Daul.

Executive Engineer in charge
1st Circle.

bt

No 2948C d/6th August 1888

Memo

With reference to
his letter No 7139.D
of 14th June 1888, the
Suplt. Engr. I Circle is
requested to forward
the Completion report
of the Sub Magistrates
of the Sub Magistrate
Cutcherry at Pittapuram.

See
30/7/88

S.E. I Circle

26.7.88 to 31.7.88
B.L. 25.00
at 30.00

4.6.88 1938 N 20-8-88
No. 2381C-25-6-88
- 2949C-6-8-88
No. 2381C 4/25 June 1888

To

C



For favour of
remarks.

WOM
23.6.88
B.W.

To W. 1938 27 21.7.88

I beg to point out that
it is difficult to remark on a case
like this without the completion
report; and to suggest that it be
made a rule that applications for
sanction to excesses on completed
works are always accompanied by
completion reports.

Lib
n 9
C.
CH. 21/7.
21/7.

FROM, P.W.C. No. 5992
J. E. Paul Esq.
Executive Engineer
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

(2) In charge FIRST CIRCLE

TO,
THE CHIEF ENGINEER
PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED 14th
DESPTCHED 16th June 1888
RECEIVED 22nd
Recd 23-7-88

No. 713 G.D.
ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

Sub Magistrates
Cutcherry at Pittapuram
Requests to obtain
the sanction of Govt.
authorising the
Examiners to pass
the excess outlay on-

To



No. 1588 G.D.

FROM,

G. J. Walch Esq.
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWARAM, 7th September 1888


SIR,

With reference to my letter No. 713
G.D. dated 14-6-88 I have the honor
to request that you will be good enough
to obtain the early sanction of Govern-
ment to the excess outlay incurred on
the construction of Sub Magistrates
Cutcherry at Pittapur in the Godavari
Eastern Division in order to remove
the Examiner's objection-

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant

G. J. Walch
Super Engineer 1st Circle

Lib



FROM,

P.W.C. 9228 E-1
m. 9629/88
G. J. Walch Esq.
 THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED

DESPTCHED

RECEIVED

7th
8th
13th

September 1888

Encls: 1.

No. 1588 *G.A.*

ENCLOSURES.

SUBJECT.

Pittapur Sub Magistrate's
Cutcherry -

Requests to obtain the
early sanction of
Government for the
excess outlay incurred
on the construction
of.

No. 1350 *G.A.*

FROM,

G. J. Walch Esq.

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWARAM, 14th August 1888

SIR,

With reference to your Memo No.
2948 C of 6th August 1888, I have the honor
to forward herewith the Completion
Report of the Sub Magistrate's Cutcherry
at Pithapuram -

I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your most obedient

C. J. Walch

Sup^r Engineer 1st Circle.

Encs

70

To

C

For favour of
early reply to this
office No. 3228C dated

27-8-88.

WMB
15.9.88

D.W.

No. 3228 C of 27th Aug 1888

FROM,

P.W.C.N. 8226
G. I. Hatch Esq
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE

TO,

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Forwarded to the
Examiner with reference
to his office note No.
1938 of 21st July 1888.

DATED 14th
DESPTCHED 16th
RECEIVED 20th } August 1888

2. The Supdy. Engineer's
letter No. 713 P.D. of 14th June
1888 is also for-

warded for favor
of the required
remarks.

No. 1350 G.A.

ENCLOSURES. #3

SUBJECT.

Pittapuram Sub-
Magistrate Cutcherry
Forward the Completion
report of-

TO W. A. 2293 of 24.9.88
m:4

RETURNED WITH THE REMARK

THAT THERE IS NO REASON WHY THE
EXCESS EXPENDITURE SHOULD NOT BE
SANCTIONED BUT THAT THE FOLLOWING
POINTS APPEAR TO DESERVE NOTICE.

(1) ITEM 9. WORKSHOP CENTAGES
ARE INSERTED AS A DISTINCT

ITEM,

ITEM. THERE IS NO RULE
REQUIRING SUCH SEPARATE ENTRY
AND IT WOULD BE BETTER THAT THE
CENTAGE SHOULD BE INCLUDED
WITH THE ITEMS OF WORK CON-
CERNED SO AS TO BRING OUT
THEIR REAL COST.

(2) ITEM 32. PETTY SUPERVISION HAS
BEEN LUMPED TOGETHER WITH
OTHER ITEMS COSTING LESS THAN
RS.500-0-0. THE OBJECT OF
LUMPING TOGETHER MINOR ITEMS
IS TO SAVE THE LABOR OF UN-
NECESSARILY DISTRIBUTING
CHARGES FOR WAGES. CHARGES
FOR PETTY SUPERVISION ARE AND
MUST BE ALWAYS SEPARATELY AC-
COUNTED FOR IN THE INITIAL
ACCOUNTS AND REQUIRE NO DIS-
TRIBUTION. IT GIVES NO
TROUBLE TO KEEP THEM SEPARATE,
AND THERE IS A DISTINCT AD-
VANTAGE IN DOING SO. I THINK
IT SHOULD BE THE RULE.

W. A.