P.W.C. No. 2673

Read S.E.'s letter
E.x's endt
S.S.'s memo

Ref. No. 978 W. d/ 26th March
1888

3 ~~The Honble Mr [illegible] [illegible]~~

PPH
22 m[illegible]

The Examiner P. W. Accts is authorised to pass the excess expenditure of Rs 908-10-3 incurred in constructing a head sluice to the Chinnam-anur anicut channel.

2. Para 1 clause 2 of the Endorsement from the Chief Engineer for Irrigation will be communicated to the Supdg Engineer VI Circle for Mr Hughes' information.

3. Paras 3 and 4 will be communicated to the Exr PW. Accounts. The Govt agree with the opinion expressed in para 4.

21. 3. 88

21/3/88

26.3.88

26/3

Rg. 20. 3. 88

No. 978 W. d/ 26th March
1888

No. 3027 W. d/ 10.11.87. ✓
2197 W. 8. 8. 87
" 2069 " " 3. 8. 87.
879. " 3. 2. 88
4689. " 3. 8. 87

Supdg Engr VI Circle ✓
Ch: Engr for Irrigation
Exr P. W. accts. With complete report.

Cir: 21. III. 88.
Rta 23. III. 88

With Order

No. 367. Irr. D.

Office of the Supt. Engineer, Circle.
Palamcottah. 11 July 1887

D/132

From

Lt. Col. J. Pennycuick R.E.
Supt. Engineer, Circle.

To,

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation.

Sir,

With reference to Items 3 & 4 of the Objectionable Item statement of this Circle for April 1887 (C.O. No. 397 I of 2d. Instant) I have the honor to refer to the ~~last~~ paras 7 & 8 Cen./Irr. of my Endorsement No. 357+ Irr. of 8: July 1887 on Mr. Grimes' letter No. 212 S.D. of 24: June 1887.

+ With No. 383 D of 22/7/87

2. Repeated references have failed to obtain any explanation whatever upon this point, and I have not been able to ascertain even what the nature of the dispute is, much less to decide what steps shall be taken to settle it.

3—

3. It seems desirable that some serious notice be taken of this matter, which has now been hanging on for six months without the slightest attempt, as far as I can ascertain, being made to settle it, and without any notice being taken of orders of Government or of references from this office.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant.

Lt Col RE
Supt Engineer, Sinde.

CHIEF ENGINEER
38 M.D

From,
The Supg Engineer
C: Circle.

To,
The Chief Engineer
for Irrign

No. 367 M.D

E.I
PW5756/

Dated 11: July 187.

W.E.I.
Will file
Sent to [illegible]
17/7/87

Reports in regard to delay in ~~the~~ sending on completion reports for Chinnamanur anicut + channel.

Enclos
3 letters

No. 42 E.W.

Note by the E.I.

In forwarding letter No 367 M.D dated 11th July from the Supg Engr C. Circle I have to state that I think some notice ought to be taken of this neglect of duty on the part of the Engineer. He has not only allowed a disputed account with a contractor to ~~hang~~ remain on for 9 months but he has not ~~although~~ called on by the Supg Engr, given any explanation regarding the affair which if properly taken up probably would have been settled without difficulty or delay

21/7/87

To
The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

G.O. 3979, 2.7.87.

P.W.C No. 5756 ✓

(3)

Rg 25.7.87

E.1

To D.W.

Write to Mr Grimes for immediate explanation

Wm

C.A.W.
The previous papers 26.7.87

3. 26.7.87 R. 3.8.87

---

(3)

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 2069 W

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 3rd August/87

READ the following

From the Supply Engineer VI Circle No. 367 m. D. d/ 11th July 1887.
" " Chief Engineer for Irrigation " 42 E.W. d/ 21st July 1887.

Mr Grimes is directed to submit full and immediate explanation:-

1st. As to the cause of delay in closing the accounts of improvements to the Chunnamanur Anicut, and the nature of the dispute with the contractor in connection with the work, and

2ndly. as to his neglect to reply to the Supply Engineer's references on the subject.

J. Grimes Esq
(thro' the Supply Engineer VI. Circle).

Jott 1/8/87

Wm 3.8.87

Cu

5936

HC
m

This paper can be recorded with reference to the G.O. censuring Mr Grimes.

C.
3-8-87

W. B
T. Madras 2-8-87.
R. 3.8.87

12/8

No 2069W dated 3rd August/87

E

3.8

No 425. M.D

Office of the Supdt. Engineer, Circle
Ambasamudram. 28th July 1887.

D/ 30

From,

Lt. Col J. Pennycuick R.E.
Supdt. Engineer, Circle.

To,

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Sir,

With reference to your No+ 383 D of 22nd Instant, I have the honor to state that it is not proposed to submit any explanation from Mr Grimes beyond that forwarded with my Endorsement No+ 357 M.D of 8th July 1887.

+at Ooty

+C No 5517 Disposed of by 383 D of 22/7/87

2. The subject was, as mentioned in para 2 of your Memo. under reply referred to in both sets of Inspection Notes because some of the works in the valley were Irrigation and others Road works.

3. Mr Grimes' explanation

referred

referred to both classes of works and was therefore forwarded to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation for transmission to your office so as to avoid a second reference on what is practically one subject.

I have the honor to be
Sir
your most obedient servant.
Lt Col RE
Supdt Engineer, Circle-

2070 W – 3. 8. 87
383 D – 22. 7. 87
337 D – 14. 7. 87

No. 2117 W a/8th August/87

P.W.C. No. 5936

(1)

Recorded with reference to G. O. No 2070 W dated 3rd August 1887.

M.
6. 8. 87

M.
8. 8

O.L.S. 52. VIII
M. 3. 8. 87

O. 1-8-87 R. 5. 8. 87

11/8

1918

From,

The Supt. Engineer
6. Circle.

To,

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

No. 425. M. D.

Dated 28th July, 1887.

R. 1. 8. 87

No. 2117 W a/8th August/87

States that it is not proposed to submit any explanation from Mr. Grimes beyond that forwarded with Endorsement No. 357 M. D. of 8th July 1887—

No. 1275 E.

Trichinopoly Division Office
20th August 1887
Despd 23rd

From,
The Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To,
The Superintending Engineer
VI Circle
Trichinopoly

Extract for Cir. 6696 sent to E.E. on 5/9.

Sir,

With reference to G.O. No. 2069 W of 3rd Instant, I have the honor to explain as follows:—

2 The Chinnamanore anicut & Head Sluice was a large & difficult work– Getting in the foundations, keeping up the ring bund, and giving the channel its supply on which about Rs 7000 Revenue depended was a tedious work and had to be done slowly and carefully, nothing could be done when the river (Suruly) was in flood, and that was often, since the work was commenced about September/85.

3 S. Kristnamachary Supervisor was in charge of the Sub-division until relieved by Mr Lowry about April/86, the work was well advanced when he left, masonry about up to top of piers about 8" &c.– The Contractors work was completed about January

January 1887, and about this time he died, his accounts could not be settled, as his heir refused to sign the final bill.

4 There was no dispute with the Contractor, he had agreed to do and did some Extra work Viz. Revetting Channel Bank at his own Expense, but now his heir claims for this work. Hence the delay in closing the accounts and this also Explains the nature of the dispute. The matter has been fully reported on by the Executive Engineer Madura Division who has all the papers in his Office.

5 I am not aware that I neglected to reply to references from the Supg Engineer. If I have done so I am very sorry and it was probably owing to my having to refer to the Sub-Division Officer Mr Lowry who was always dilatory &c whom I had to report twice in the few months he was in charge, and owing to the Constant changes in Sub-Division Officers afterwards, as already reported.

I have &c &c.

(Signed) J. Grimes
Executive Engineer.

No 1605E

Trichinopoly Division Office
13th September 1887

Desp'd 15th

From,
J. Grimes Esquire
Executive Engineer
Trichinopoly Division

To, The Superintending Engineer
II Circle
Trichinopoly

Sir,

With reference to your memo No 336 TC of 6th Instant, I have the honor to inform you that Mr Lowry was in charge of the Sub-Division up to 28th February, he had repeated orders to report but he did not. In March Mr Supervisor Taylor was in charge, but he had plenty to do, in settling the years accounts. In April Mr Gopalakristna Iyer took charge & he reported on the matter in May. On receipt of his report it had to be checked in the office with the accounts, records &c this may have taken a little time, but it was returned to him end of May or early in June approved by me, and with orders to settle with the Contractor's heir, and this he tried to do before he left the Sub-Division on 27th June, but the man would not come to terms. On the 7th July

I

I was relieved by Mr Hughes-

2 I hear that the "order Book" has been made away with, if that can be found it will settle all disputes, as in it the Contractor has signed for every order he has received, or for what Extra work he agreed to do, this must have happened during the frequent transfers &ca of Subordinates - I request you will be pleased to order that this Book be traced out, the list of records handed over from one Subordinate to another will shew, who is responsible for its disappearance-

I have &c &ca

(Signed) J. Grimes
Executive Engineer

(True Copies)

No. 594. M.D

Submitted to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. with reference to G.O. No. 2069 W of 3rd August 1887-

2 The first portion of Mr Grimes reply refers to delay in the Execution of the work which is not the question under Consideration-

3 It is only verbally correct to say that there was no dispute with the

Contractor

Contractor; the dispute was with his heir who took over his rights and responsibilities, and it is certainly not even verbally correct to say that the only dispute was as regards the Extra Work, Viz revetting channel bank, done by the Contractor-

4 By a report received from the present Executive Engineer since the receipt of the G.O. under reply it appears that the disputes with the Contractor refer to four distinct sets of questions affecting more than twenty items and Concerning questions of quantities, rates, and measurements.

5 This report was based upon one from the Sub-divisional officer dated the 18th May and presumably received in the Executive Engineer's office before the 21st but no notice was taken of the latter nor was I made aware of its existence until Mr Hughes took charge of the Division in July, when the subject was promptly taken up and reported on. The necessary instructions have since been given and there is no reason to doubt that the matter will be properly settled

settled soon.

6 The last paragraph of Mr Grimes' letter is simply incomprehensible. The subject was noticed in the G.O's on the objectionable item statements for November, December, January, February, March, April, and May; in forwarding extracts from those G.O's to the Executive Engineer, in every case but one special instructions for the early settlement of the question were given, to all of which was given the stereotyped reply that it would be settled shortly.

7 In my inspection notes of May/87 the Executive Engineer was desired to submit a full report upon the whole subject to reach this office by the 15th June. No notice whatever was taken of this and in answer to a reminder, a reply was received on the 4th July simply repeating the old explanation that there was a dispute which would be settled shortly.

8 Mr Lowry to whom Mr Grimes refers left the Division at the end of February and can certainly not be held responsible for the latter's proceedings from March to July, nor for his having actually had a full report from the then Sub-Divisional Officer (Mr Gopalakrishna Aiyar) in his office from the 20th of May till the middle of July (when he handed over charge of the Division) without making the slightest attempt to deal with it.

9. Mr Grimes' second letter No 160 SE of 13th September is written in reply to one of mine reminding him that the Sub-Divisional Officer's report referred to above must have been received in his office before the end of May, and asking whether under those circumstances he wished to modify the statement in para 4 of his first letter as to the nature of the dispute with the Contractor.

10 The disappearance of the order book referred to in the last paragraph of this letter is now brought to notice for the first time. It will be enquired into, but is beside the question under discussion.

Lieut Col R.E.
Superintending Engineer
6th Circle

Kodaikanal
19th September 1887

D/ 21st

P.W.C. No 7440

Palm[illegible] 27/9

From.
The Supd. Engineer
6th Circle
To.
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D

No 594. M. D

Dated 19th Septr /87
Despd. 21.

R 23.9.87

Prompted
E A on 7.11.87

Submits copies of letters from Mr. Grimes, executive engineer, explaining the delay in ~~closing~~ the accounts of improvements to the Chimamanir anicut and the dispute with the contractor –

Despd. 11-11-87.

Cno 7440.

I have init'd the draft order, which is in circle
[illegible] 8.11.

Note

In his letter No 367 M. D. of 11. 7. 87, the S. E. VI Circle brought to notice that he could obtain no information from Mr. Grimes (then Ex. Engr. Madura) relative to delay in closing the accounts of the improvements to the Chimamanir anicut, & that his reminders on the subject remained unanswered.

In G.O. No 2069 W – 1887, of 3. 8. 87, ~~[illegible]~~ Mr. Grimes was called upon for immediate explanation.

In Cno 7440, the S. E. submits Mr. Grimes' explanation, which he apparently consider un=satisfactory.

It now remains to be decided what notice shall be taken of the matter.

This same matter was mentioned in paras 7 & 8 of the S.E.'s letter No 357 M.D. d/ 8.7.87, on which G.O. No 2070 W d/ 3.8.87 was passed, & as Mr Grimes has already been censured, the enclosed draft order will perhaps meet the case.

Cr

8.11.87

N.B. The present current was received in this office on 23.9.87 - It appears to have been sent to I office for certain previous papers which were there - & I office appear to have returned it tied up with a disposal on a ~~[illegible]~~ * different subject - The current was thus lost sight of for some weeks, & was sent to me for disposal only on 7.11.87. Cr

---

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

No. 3027W

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 10th Novr /8

READ the following

From the S.E. VI Circle No 594 M.D. d/ 19th Sept 1887.

The explanations submitted by Mr Grimes are unsatisfactory, but as he has already been censured for this and other matters in G.O. No 2070 W dated 3rd August 1887, the Govt. will refrain from making any further remarks.

MM

8.11.87

S.E. VI Circle

Despd. 11-11-87.

Cr

9/11/87

2069 W 3.8.87
397 I. 2.7.87
468 I 3.8.87
2070 W 3.8.87
2117 W 8.8.87
579 I. 28.9.87
280 I. 20.4.87
204 I. 17.3.87
782 I. 17.11.86

No. 3027 W of 10th Nov/87

O.O.H. 10.11.

Belongs to Sheaappa Aiyer's claim file - but need not go to the C.E. M. - to be put with the file when it comes back from him

27/11

21/11

14/11

[illegible] 2258

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Trichinopoly 23rd February 1888
D. 24/.

No. 1132 M.D.

From
J. W. Rundall Esqr. M.I.C.E.
~~The~~ Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation.
Thro' the Examiner P.W. Accts.

Mis Fo. [illegible] 16/3

Sir,

ENCLOSURES. 1
1 Completion Report.

As directed in G.O. No 87 I dated 3rd February/88 on the Examiner's Objectionable Item statement in the Accounts of the Circle, for the month of October/87, I have the honor to submit, for the orders of Govt, the Completion Report for constructing Head sluice to No 9 Chinnamanur Anicut Channel in the Madura Division -

2. For the above work an Estimate of Rs 2,490 was sanctioned by the Supdg. Engineer, Tank Restoration Scheme, in his Register No $\frac{14T}{M.}$ of 1885-86. The work was commenced in August 1885 and completed in 1886, but its accounts were finally closed only in September/87 - the

date of completion noted in the Completion Report, and the outlay amounts to Rs 3398-10-3, or Rs 908-10-3 in excess of the estimate.

3. As stated by Mr Hughes, Exe: Engineer, now in charge of the Division, the deviations from the estimate cannot be now explained, as all officers and subordinates who were connected with the work have left the Division.

4. It is observed that there was a great delay in the settlement of accounts of the work, this has been already reported on by my predecessor in his No 594 M.D. dated 19' September /87, recorded in G.O. No 3027 W dated 10' November /87.

+ submitted thro E.I.
+ ~~Not received~~
~~MM~~
[illegible]

5. The Contractor's claims were fully enquired into and reported on by the present Executive Engineer, & the amounts to be paid decided on under instructions from my predecessor, but as the Contractor has still refused to accept what was offered, the amount has been ordered to be placed in deposit.

6. The Completion Report under reference was received from the Examiner P.W. Acts on the 23rd December /87, together with another for repairs &c to the Chinnamanur Anicut Channel, in the ordinary course after verification in his office, and both were recorded in this office. In cases of the kind it appears advisable that the Examiner should point out the objectionable excess &c, when returning the Reports.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant
J. W. Rundalls
Supg. Engineer, Circle

No. 45 I dated 14th March 1888.

---

1. Forwarded with enclosure to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, with the following remarks.

2. A completion report for the work was received but as the excess over estimate was over Rs: 500/, a draft endorsement to the effect that the sanction of Government was necessary under P. W. Code para 352 C(2) was passed by the undersigned, but through an oversight it was not copied on the Completion Report when transmitting the same to the Superintending Engineer.

3. The circumstances of this case suggest

of some modification of P. W. Code para 1828, with a view to expediting matters in regard to works similarly situated. Code para 1828 allows Executive Engineer in cases of delay on the part of contractors to receive final payment for more than one month after the final certificate has been passed, to apply to the Superintending Engineer for sanction to close the accounts of the work and the contractor and to credit the balance due to "Deposit". The object of the rule is not gained, if the accounts of a completed work are allowed to be kept open for nearly a year as in the present instance. To avoid delays of this nature it seems desirable that there should be some provision in the P. W. Code making it obligatory on the Executive Engineer, after a reasonable time, say two months to take steps either to close the accounts of the work and send in the completion report, or to obtain definite sanction of superior authority to keep the accounts open.

4. If you agree with me please obtain the orders of Government in the General Branch on the subject of the preceding paragraph.

Major R.E.
Examiner. P. W. Accounts
Madras

Encs: One.

E.P. 14/3
14/3

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

EXAMINER
No. 4476
27 FEB 1888
ENCLOSURES /
P. W. ACCOUNTS.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

CHIEF ENGINEER
No. 34 M.d
15 MAR 88
FOR IRRIGATION.

To

The Chief Engineer
Irrg^n

Thro' the Examiner P. W. Accts

No. 1132 M.d.

W.E.P.

Dated 23'
~~D~~ 24 } ~~February~~ 1888
Received

The code rule as it stands is clear on the point, but [illegible] No. 278 W. d/ 26-3-88 [illegible] of the [illegible] of the Examiner [illegible]

Enclosure. 1

Chinnamanur Anicut & Channel:—

15-3-88

submits for orders of Govt. Completion Report for Const^n Hd. Sluice to No. 9—

To E.I. with file

W. H.
17-3-88

out that owing to an error in the Examiner's Office the completion certificate was returned without comment to the Superintending Engineer last December and therefore the matter was not taken up by the Superintending Engineer until the receipt of G O No 87 I dated 3 February 1888.

4 The Chief Engineer for Irrigation can see no advantage in making an additional Code rule to meet cases in which there is delay in closing accounts after the completion of a work, as there is a difficulty in practice although not in theory in laying down when a work is completed. It is thought that Government must look to Superintending Engineer to see that works are carried out to completion as expeditiously as practicable and that the accounts of Contractors and others are closed in a reasonable time. In the case under reference the matter was brought to notice by the Superintending Engineer and action taken in G O No 2070 W dated 3 August 1887

Chepauk
17th March 1888

W H Rund Colonel R.E.
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

To,

The Chief Engineer P.W.D.

P.W.C. No 2758

3027 W—10—11—87
2067 W—8—8—87
2069–70 W—3—8—87
397 W I—2—7—87
87 I—8—2—88
468 I—3—8—87