

No 4235.C d/2-11-88

will kindly enquire into the matter and
627.C d/25-9-88
further to him by giving the order to him
if nothing could be done the order to him
back the sum of money eight and 0/10
which is due to him on the contract for
the erection of the Post Office at Indiana
sum. If this also could not be done
the Government to give him
the sum of money to go to the Civil Court for
the recovery of money due to him

The Govt. see no

reason to modify
the order No 4235.C
d/2^d November/88, passed
by the Chief Engineer
on the petition of
20th September/88.

Cir. 10/12/88
Bo. 13.12.88

18/12
20/12

Mon
5.12.500
8/12/88
To the Petitioner. 15/12

person to entrust with the
Contract of Works he con-
-plains of—

To the Petitioner
The Petitioner
2/11/88

Northwich

S. 3387 Wd/9-12-87

188

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current Nos 9556, 9557.

From

M. A. Venkataramana
Contractor, Induramam, S. Arcot District.
ENCLOS.

No. —

Dated 20th September 1888

Received 22nd do —

SUBJECT.

Appeals against
the rejection by the Ex.
Engineer, of his tender
for certain works in
the S. Arcot Dist.

DISPOSAL.

No. 3627 C Dated 25th Sept. 1888

Referred to the Supd.
Engineer & Circle for
favor of report.
(By order)

Sd/- W. C. B.

Sd/-

Dw.

20th September 88

Induramam.

Emergent



To The Chief Engineer
D. F. W.
Madras

With humble submission
and due respect the undersigned (M. A.
Venkataramana Esq.) Contractor at
Induramam, South Arcot, begs to bring
the following to your honor's favorable
consideration and early orders

About Rs 13,000, having
been sanctioned for repairing the tanks
of Engore and Pattanam villages and
for a construction work at Hootteriputh
and tenders having been invited by
the Executive Engineer from all sides
the Petitioner (Contractor) submitted
his tender undertaking to deposit
10 per cent of the amount and to
accept the work at 500 Rs less
than the estimated & sanctioned
amount.

While the Petitioner was
going on with the construction
of the Post Office (Postmaster's
Quarters) the then Sub-Divisional

Officer promised him these works, and when the Petitioner applied, for the Construction work at Kootterepant, to the Executive Engineer, he sent him an endorsement requiring him to send up his tender after receiving sanction.

When the Sanction was actually received for this as well as for other works, the Petitioner sent his tender but to his great disappointment - his tender which, he thinks, was submitted ^{previously to} ~~with~~ others was not cared for.

It appears that there has been a Rule in force in the Dept. that the works should be given to those who ~~are~~ consent to take up at the lowest rate.

Even ⁱⁿ the said Post Office case the actual amount, less Rs 80 and odd was paid to him - and not the actual amount.

In this case he bid 500 Rs less than the Estimated sum, and to insure his speedy work he promised to deposit 10 per cent.

Such being the circumstances the reason for the Sub-divisional

Officer's not accepting his tender is not known. The present works in question have been given to strangers not even to the Contractors other than the Petitioner, at no rate except the sanctioned one, thus causing a loss of Rs 500 to the Government.

The Petitioner also sent a Telegram - phic message to the Executive Engineer in the following words, in confirmation of his tender, "Ready Deposit 10 per cent. for tender, Will accept 500 less estimated amount." but no answer has been given up to the second.

Now your honor will see that the Rule, that the works must be given to those that accept them at the lowest rate, was in force when the Post Office work was given him and that the same Rule is not cared for in the particular instance.

As the Petitioner really received some 80 Rs less than the Estimated amount in the Post Office case he humbly requests your honor to order payment of the said sum in case of the Rule being not in force or to offer him kindly the said works in question

than the Estimated amount
of Rs about Rs 13,000 thus showing
a gain of Rs 500 to the Govt.

That this said work
have been actually given to some
strangers who are not Contractors
at the same rate as sanctioned
— thus causing a loss of Rs 500.

That he having promised
in one instance to accept some
work some 80 Rs less than the
Estimated amount, the work
was given him and after finishing
the work he received the sanctioned
amount less 80 Rs.

That as the said does not
seem to be in force in the particular
instance when he promised to
take up the said works 500 Rs
less, he humbly prays to be favoured
with an order to draw the said
sum or to be favoured alternatively
with order to get the said
works.

works.

and that he being much aggrieved
by the unreasonable refusal to accept
his tenders, he humbly prays that
the Honorable Government will
be kind enough to make delicate
enquiries about this and render
him justice by ordering the works
to be given him —

For this he again duty bound

I shall ever Obedient
— 26/11/1904
Contractor

Sundararam



Enclosure - 2

P. W. Dept. 9556

11060/88
2/4/7/88
25 10-88

N^o 2231

L. D. for report

Executive Engineer

R/22.9.88

11/10/88

Deep 15

P. W. Dept.
To be returned with reply.

Ref. No 652 W
27.9.88.

No. 3627 C of 25 Sept. 1888

Referred to the
Suptg. Engineer
V Circle for favour
of report.

(By order)

[Signature]

Capt. R.E.
Under Secy. to Govt. P.W.D.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,

V Circle, Madras,

No. 3278.

Baugiller
Chapat, 27 October 1888.

From

Col. H. M. Vibart R.E.

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, V CIRCLE,

To

The Chief Engineer

P.W. Department

SIR,

Enclosures.

In returning your endorsement No. 3627C dated 25 September 1888, I have the honor to report that the petitioner was not considered by the Executive Engineer a fit person to entrust with the contract he asked for. The Executive Engineer states that he was reported against by Sub Engineer Conductor Heimg who complained of the slow way in which he worked; also that he used only borrowed capital and could not take up large works or execute them satisfactorily.

The contracts have been given to

to persons interested in the resto-
ration of the two tanks, and
who will therefore take an
interest in carrying out the
works efficiently.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedt servt.

Alfred W. S. Cole RE

Suptg Engineer

5th Circle

No. 3627 C of 25-9-88
 " 1964 W " 22-7-87
 " 3387 W " 9-12-87

Memorandum

The petitioner is informed that the Chief Engineer sees no reason to interfere with the action of the Executive Engineer in the matter of the contracts referred to.

WCB
 31.10.88

31/10/88

From
 THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
 V Circle,
 To
 THE Chief Engineer
 P.W. Department

Dated 29 October 1888
 Recd.



ENCLOSURES, 1

No. 3278,

M. K. Venkatarama Iyer

Reporting that petitioner is not considered by the Executive Engineer a fit person to entrust with the Contract of Works he complains of—

The Petitioner
 2/11/88

North Circular



To the Government

The humble memorial of
 M. K. Venkatarama Iyer, Contractor,
 Lindivanam, South Arcot District,
 most respectfully sheweth:—

That the memorialist contracted to erect a new Postoffice in the town of Lindivanam. The work was estimated for Rs 630-0-0 and odd. He did the work for five hundred rupees and odd: in this there is a gain of eighty rupees and odd to the Government. It is a rule with the Engineer Department to contract with those by whom there is gain to Government. When, lately, the Executive Engineer received orders to get three works estimated at about ten thousand and odd, done, he offered to do the work for 9000 rupees; in this a gain of one thousand rupees and odd to the Government.

WCB
 2/12/88

2/12/88

2/12/88

with order

