Bundle no 7

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 166

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் Nov 89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

55

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D. துறை

அரசாணை எண்.
மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 1026

அச்சகம்
பலவகை

நாள் : 13.4-1889 198 .

௨௭௭.

கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

3

81 Sheets

81+2 Admin'l (cutter

18,000—15-8-87.

13th April 1889, No. 1026 W., Public Works.

1026

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

General.
Establishment.

Read—the following papers:—

Letter from W. Jopp, Esq., dated 14th March 1889, No. 748 R.N.
Endorsement by the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, dated 30th March 1889, No. 687.
Note by the Acting Chief Engineer, Public Works Department, dated 5th April 1889.

Order—dated 13th April 1889, No. 1026 W., Public Works.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has had under consideration the letter from Mr. W. Jopp, Executive Engineer, in charge Ramnad division, appealing against the censure passed upon him conjointly with Mr. Target in G.O., No. 173 W., dated 22nd January 1889, and praying for a reconsideration of his case.

2. In the circumstances now brought to notice in Mr. Jopp's letter, His Excellency in Council is pleased to withdraw the censure conveyed in the G.O. in so far as it relates to Mr. Jopp; but, as stated by the Acting Chief Engineer, the extent of the work that was being carried out on the Ramnad tank should have attracted the Executive Engineer's attention and induced him to have made an early inspection, when in all probability the errors committed would have been at once detected.

3. Early steps will be taken for posting a sub-divisional officer to the Ramnad division.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) R. R. E. DRAKE-BROCKMAN, Lt.-Col., R.E.,
Ag. Joint Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
" Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

Exd. J. Henricus.
S pare Copies

GENERAL.
ESTABLISHMENT.

Gobt. of {1889} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated April, 13*th.*

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 13th April 1889, No. 1026 W.

APRIL.

Mr. Jopp, Executive Engineer

Orders withdrawing the censure passed on — in G.O., No. 173 W., of 22nd January 1889, in connection with work at the Ramnad tank.

Pbl. No. 10684

No. 4055 Cd/23rd Oct. 1888

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

From

The ~~Superintending~~ Executive Engineer,

6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Madras

No. 361 PW

Dated 18th ~~20th~~ October 1888
Received 22

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
22 OCT 88
P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS

Enclosure. Nil

No. 4055 Cd/23rd Oct. 1888

Reporting on the Petition from Piece worker Selia Thaven regarding claims for work done in the Ramnad Large Tank.

Memo.

The Chief Engineer will await the further report promised in which all the facts should be clearly explained.

22.10.88

22/10/88

No. 3941 Cd/17-10-88

S.E. VI Circle
D 24/10

J.S. 25/10

W. With memo

W 2b

X

4

1888.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 10437

Petn. From S. Mayakothan
Piece Worker
Ramnad

No. — Enclos.—

Dated 11th Octr 1888

Received 15 — do —

SUBJECT.

Seeking redress for the injustice shewn him by the Exec. Engr. Ramnad in not paying him the balance for work done in connection with the closing of the breaches of the waste weir of the road between Muthaloor & Ramnad caused by heavy flood in the Ramnad Big Tank & for the planting of nanal in the tank.

DISPOSAL.

No. 3941C Dated 17th Octr 1888

Transferred to the S.E. VI circle for disposal. It is requested that a copy of the order passed on the case be forwarded to this office for information.

(Sd) W. L. C. Baddeley
Capt. R.E.
Dy. Chief Engineer P.W.D.

(Sd) H. R. M.
16-10-88

Desp
17/10

Jw
22/10

DW. 1026 12,195.

The S. E's letter is addressed to E. I. through E. W.

Please say whether any remarks are to be made when forwarding the file to E. I.

FB.
28/XI/88

Ho.
29.11.88

1026

No. 4055 C of 23-10-88
" 3941 C " 17-10-88

1888.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 12195

From The Suptg. Engr VI circle
To The Ch: Engr for Irrign
Thro' E.W.

ENCLOS.—

No. 454 R.N.
Dated 23rd Nov 1888
Received 28 — do —

SUBJECT.

Submitting for orders certain correspondence regarding an overpayment of Rs 575 reported to have been made for work done in improving the Ramnad Large Tank.

overpaid by Mr. Target Rs 373
— do — Mr. Goff " 202
575

DISPOSAL.

No. 4793 C Dated 30th Nov 1888

Forwarded.

(Sd) H. R. Mead Col. R.E.
Chief Engr P. W. D.

D 1/12/88

W 3/12

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Trichinopoly 18' October 1888.
Recd 20°.

No. 361 RN

From W Hughes Esqr
~~The Superintending~~ Executive Engineer, in ch:
6th Circle.

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

Sir,

ENCLOSURES.

With reference to your Endorsement No 3941 C dated 17' October 1888 on a petition from piece worker Selia Kotham (or Shevan) I have the honor to inform you that considerable overpayments have been made for work on the Ramnad Large Tank and that the petitioner is one of the men who has been overpaid.

A special report will be submitted on receipt of Mr Target's explanation.

2. The Executive Engineer proposes to retain Rs 66 balance of Selia Shevan's bills as a set off against the overpayment made, but as there seems to be some doubt as to the exact amount

This clerk will [illegible] [illegible] on [illegible] the matter [illegible] [illegible] the case settle it is [illegible] [illegible] E.E. [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] Mr Target [illegible] Ramnad [illegible] 24/10 amount of overpayment I have called for further information.

3. As to the Rs 100 claimed for Nanel planting the pieceworker has so far given no proof that he has done work in excess of what has been paid for, and when recently questioned by the Executive Engineer stated that he had done the planting in place of other nanel which had died - As the accounts shew all the planting provided in the revised estimate to have been done and paid for, it is at least very improbable that the pieceworker's claim can be sustained - He has been informed that if he can prove anything to be due it will be paid.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

W Hughes.
Executive Engineer
M. Ch: W Sinde.

9R

1026

8, 7

1889.

P. W. DEPARTMENT.

Current No. 31

From

T. Rajagopalachari
1st grade pleader
Ramnad.

No. ——

Enclos.—

Dated 25th Dec. 1888

Received 4th Jany 1889.

SUBJECT.

Requesting to order the final settlement of the accounts of Selayakottan, a piece worker in the P. W. D. Ram Divn. on a/c of certai works executed by him.

DISPOSAL.

No. 52 C Dated 8th Jany 1889

Transferred to the Suptg. Engineer VI circle for early disposal.

(By order)

(Sd) W. L. C. Baddeley
Capt R. E.
Dy: Chief Engineer P. W.

D 9/1

J. 14/1

22nd January 1889, No. 173 W., Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

vo 26

General.
Account.

Read—the following papers :—

From W. HUGHES, Esq., Officiating Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation (through the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department), dated Trichinopoly, 23rd November 1888, No. 454 R.N.

I have the honor to submit for orders the enclosed correspondence regarding an overpayment of Rs. 575, reported to have been made for work done in improving the Ramnad large tank.

2. From December 1887 to April 1888 the works at Ramnad and in its neighbourhood were carried out under the supervision of the Division officer, assisted by a tank superintendent named Hari Row. On measurements submitted by this man, Mr. Target paid Rs. 581-0-8 in December and January, and Mr. Jopp Rs. 618-15-2 in February to April.

3. As Hari Row had been appointed on a high salary on the strong recommendation of Mr. Target, who wished to have him made a sub-overseer on Rs. 40 in consideration of the numerous good qualities which he was considered to possess, I do not think Mr. Jopp is much to be blamed for regarding him as in some sort holding the position of an overseer, and for placing some confidence in the opinion of Mr. Target, illustrated as it was by the large payments made on the superintendent's bills. Mr. Jopp did not discover until April that the superintendent was useless or until June that he was dishonest.

4. The Code rules give no authority to make payments on bills prepared by men in the tank superintendent's position, but it is not easy to say how far the rules can be strictly enforced in a division like Ramnad worked by a temporary staff. It appears to me that the Division officer, unless he can check every work before paying for it, must accept some risks; but whether Mr. Jopp has accepted more than was justifiable is for you to decide.

5. He took charge on the 16th February and was in camp the whole of March and April. During May he spent a few days at Ramnad, but did not then check the work as Hari Row was busily engaged on some urgent work at the palace in preparation for the zemindar's marriage. On his return from camp in June he at once took steps to check the work, with the result that he found the pits shown in the measurement book so exaggerated in their dimensions that they could not be identified. The result of measurements made as correctly as was possible after such a lapse of time showed that Mr. Target had overpayed Rs. 373 and Mr. Jopp Rs. 202. Mr. Jopp had fortunately withheld 10 per cent. from the bills which he paid. It will be noticed also that he had attempted to get the work checked by Supervisor Murugesam Pillai, who reported on the 4th March (the tank superintendent being then on casual leave) that the work-people were cheating. On the following day correct measurements were called for, but the supervisor sent no reply. Again in April the supervisor was directed to check the measurements, but failed to do so. This the Executive Engineer appears to excuse on the ground of the supervisor's ill health at the time. Some suspicion had been aroused by the report of the 4th March, but it was against the work-people, not against Hari Row; and, when the bills were subsequently received, the incident had escaped Mr. Jopp's memory as he was engaged in dealing with various other irregularities.

6. From Mr. Target's explanation and the Executive Engineer's letter No. 2254 R.N., dated 12th November 1888, commenting on it, it appears that Mr. Target checked bills amounting to only Rs. 50 odd and inspected work for Rs. 214, which he found it impossible to check, and considered there was no reason to suspect of being incorrectly measured. I believe Mr. Jopp to be exact and pains-taking in his work, and do not think he can be very far mistaken in his estimate of the overpayments. At the same time I do not mean to imply that there were any overpayments on the small portion of work actually check-measured by Mr. Target. It would appear from Mr. Jopp's report that he was unable to identify the work done by each man. This makes it impossible to enforce by legal proceedings the recovery of anything from these piece-workers, who have been paid in full, since the amount of overpayment to individuals cannot be arrived at.

7. The bills paid by Mr. Jopp himself to four piece-workers amount to Rs. 614 (*vide* his No. 1753 R.N., dated 28th September 1888). On calling on the piece-workers to accompany him and point out the work which they did, only one man, Kalimuthu Pillai, complied. The work, which he claimed to have done, on being measured was found to be less than paid for by Rs. 52. There is a strong suspicion that this man claimed as his own work done by others, but since the others did not attend and the man who measured the work had been dismissed, there is no proof that the overpayment in this case exceeded Rs. 52. Mr. Jopp proposed to recover Rs. 139, but on what defensible grounds I cannot see. Two of the piece-workers did only Rs. 51 worth of work between them, and as there is no money due them nothing can be recovered. The fourth man is Selia Kothen, about whose claims I made report to the Chief Engineer in my letter No 361 R.N., dated 18th October 1888. If Kalimuthu Pillai was overpaid only Rs. 52, the other men must have been overpaid Rs. 150, or nearly 40 per cent. of the Rs. 379 paid them. If the overpayments were equally distributed amongst the four, they would amount to 33 per cent. It is pretty certain that Selia Kothen must therefore have been overpaid at least Rs. 108, the total payments to him being Rs. 328. Rs. 66 is, however, all of his that there is in hand, and I think we must be content with this. The total recoveries which can be made are in my opinion—

	RS.
From Kalimuthu Pillai	52
Selia Kothen	66
Salary for June due to Superintendent Hari Row	30
Total ...	148

8. I request permission to credit these amounts to the work and let whatever other overpayments have been made stand as a charge against the work.

9. The Executive Engineer reports that he has no evidence to prove a criminal attempt at cheating on the part of Hari Row.

No. 4793 C.

Forwarded.

30th November 1888.

(Signed) H. R. MEAD, Colonel, R.E.,
Ag. Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

Note by the Acting Chief Engineer, Public Works Department.

In his letter above recorded, the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, brings to notice an overpayment of Rs. 575 made on account of work done in improving the Ramnad tank.

2. There is nothing to show when the work was begun, but payments on account of it were made on the tank superintendent's measurements as follows:—

Rs. 581–0–8 by Mr. Target in December 1887 and January 1888.
Rs. 618–15–2 by Mr. Jopp between February and April 1888.

3. It thus appears that a sum of Rs. 1,199–15–10 was paid away by the Executive Engineer without any check being exercised over the measurements submitted by the tank superintendent. This, although most irregular, is not the worst feature of the case, which appears to be the fact that the work was allowed to go on for months without any check by the Divisional officer.

4. Mr. Jopp joined the division in February 1888, and up to that time apparently the work had not been inspected and checked by Mr. Target as it should have been. Mr. Jopp should therefore have at once attended to the matter, and his excuse that he was absent in camp in March and April, and that he endeavoured to get the work checked, that is, ordered it to be checked by a supervisor who failed to do so, cannot be accepted.

5. It was clearly Mr. Jopp's duty to have attended personally to the matter, and had the check taken place in March, there would probably have been no trouble or difficulty. Mr. Jopp, however, did not examine the work until June—six months after a payment of more than Rs. 500 had been made on account of the work,—and for this he deserves severe censure. Mr. Target is also to blame for making so large a payment in the absence of any check.

6. The Superintending Engineer should at once see that the accounts of the work are put in order and report what loss has been incurred.

7. The undersigned recommends that the amount overpaid may be charged against the work.

18th January 1889.

(Signed) H. R. MEAD, Colonel, R.E.,
Ag. Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

ORDER—dated 22nd January 1889, No. 173 W., Public Works.

The Government have perused the foregoing papers with regret.

2. The Superintending Engineer will communicate to Messrs. Target and Jopp the displeasure of Government at their neglect of duty.

3. On the recommendation of the Chief Engineer sanction is accorded to the amount overpaid being charged off to the work. The Superintending Engineer will at once check the accounts of the work and report the loss.

4. Should a similar case occur, the Government must hold the Executive Engineer concerned personally responsible for any loss incurred through his negligence.

(True Extract.)

Captain, R.E.,
Under-Secy. to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. J. Henricus.
Spare Copies

GENERAL.
ACCOUNT.

Govt. of {1889} Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated January, 22nd.

Recd.

Encl.

G.O., 22nd Jan. 1889, No. 173 W.

JANUARY.

Ramnad Tank

Directing the overpayment of Rs. 575 made on account of work done in improving the — to be written off to the work, and censuring Messrs. Target and Jopp for neglect of duty in connection therewith.

Entrack from the Inspection notes of W. Jopp Esquire, Executive Engineer, Ramnad Division, for the month of June 1888.

24th & 27th June 1888.

Improvements to Ramnad tank

Estimate
Rs. 20,040
Sanctioned
G.O. 36-1/86-87
Expenditure
upto end of
May Rs. 14,078-4-2.

I inspected about 3 miles of this tank bund at the South end: The earthwork improvements to the bund under the Estimate noted in the margin is supposed to be completed except in the last 1½ to 1¾ miles at the south end the total length of the bund being 7 miles:

I am having the completed part carefully checked so as to ascertain whether it is at proper level throughout. The slopes of the front and rear which should be at 3 and 2 to 1 respectively seem really to be less.

The Estimated amount of earthwork is 40,54,691 cft and the quantity done upto date is 30,35,846 c. feet. The estimated and actual rates are Rs 3-4-0 / Rs 3-4-5

The chief objects of my visit were:—

(1) to ascertain whether work had really been started again as it was

stated to be (2) to check measure work done at that end of the tank since December 1887.

(1) I was surprised to find a gang of about 70 men actually at work and Overseer Subramania Iyer is hopeful of getting a considerable increase shortly. As no earth-work of any sort has been in progress since March last I hope that we have now made a start.

(2) From December 1887 up to April 1888 works at Ramnad and its neighbourhood have been carried on by the Executive Engineer himself with the assistance of Tank Superintendent Hari Row.

This man has been taking measurements and submitting bills for payment on all such works.

During the late Executive Engineer's time he submitted bills for 2,51,106 cubic feet of work on the Ramnad Tank, payments were made in full to the extent of Rs 747-14-1.

During my incumbency he has submitted bills (during February & March) for 2,29,111 c. feet of earth work and payments were made to the extent of Rs 619, stoppages to the extent of Rs 68 having been withheld (10. per cent).

I had not been able to check measure the work done in February & March during my incumbency before this date, because I was in camp, during the whole of March & April. During the few days of May that I was in Ramnad I was unable to take Hari Row away from the urgent work he was supervising in the Palace at that place but immediately on my return to Ramnad in June I took steps to check the work which results in the present report.

I may however here remark that I directed Supervisor Murugesam Pillai to measure the tank Superintendent's work in the month of April but he did not do so, I suppose from the bad state of his health at the time. ~~(2)~~ (1)

(3) C. T. Hari Row and Overseer

Subramania Iyer were present on the morning of the 24th June when I attempted to check measure Hari Row's work.

The pits were all tolerably well defined and capable of check measurements. I was not however able to identify a single pit entered in the book. This occurred on the 24th June.

Thinking it possible that I had not given Hari Row sufficient notice of inspection, I directed him to number each pit in his book and to peg out the corresponding pit on the ground before the 27th June on which day I would again inspect.

On the 27th June I again inspected but I was unable to find any of the book measurements agree with the pit measurements. The book measurements of lengths, breadths and depths being almost without exception far in excess of the actual pit measurements.

There was no question

as

as to the pits being those of which entry had been made in the book as their position was near to the 9 Vents sluice and was described in the book and was quite unmistakeable.

On the first day of inspection namely the 24th June when unable to identify the pits C. S. Hari Row stated that they were correct and that Mr Target had check measured them. There was however no record in the measurement book or elsewhere in support of this statement.

On the second day of my inspection namely the 27th June when Hari Row had been unable to identify a single pit with his measurement, I again asked him to explain; he stated that he had not himself actually taken the measurement but had stood at some distance and had entered the measurement in his book according as the Cavalgars who were measuring the work, called out to him, that thus the errors must have arisen.

This may be true, but even if standing at a distance Hari Row should have been able to detect when a pit was only 8" or 9" instead of 18" in depth as must have been called out to him by the Cavalgars in some cases. Again it is not easy to reconcile his statement made on the 24th (that Mr. Target had check measured the work) with the fact that none of the pit measurements agreed with the entries in his book.

Under these circumstances I have called upon C. S. Hari Row for an explanation in writing which will be sent to the Suptg: Engineer on receipt and have directed the Overseer to relieve him of his duties at once.

I am measuring up the whole of the work billed for by Hari Row and will submit a full report as soon as possible.

The lump sum provision of

of Rs 1520 made in the Estimate for repairs to masonry works, will I believe, be very inadequate, just as was the case with the lump sum provision for the Rajasingamangalam Tank.

An expenditure of Rs 547 was made against it, before I assumed charge without any details of the proposed repairs, having been submitted to the Suptg: Engineer for approval.

I have been urging on the Overseer, the necessity of getting in these detail measurements. The tank itself is now dry but as water is still standing on the rear floor and apron of the 9 & 11 vent sluices to which the chief items of repair are necessary, he has been unable as yet to do much towards it. I have directed him to bale out the water in rear as soon as he can and prepare the Estimates as the year is getting advanced and we apparently cannot count on more than 2½ months of dry weather.

(signed) W. Jopp
Executive Engineer
9—7—88.

(True Extract)

W. Hughes
Executive Engineer
in Ch: of VI Circle.

23-11-88
u/f 26°

Cm

CHIEF ENGINEER
No. 171
5-DEC 88
FOR IRRIGATION

Ramnad
30-6-88

To

The Overseer D.P.W.
Ramnad

1026

Most respected Sir,

In obedience to your memo No 332 I most humbly beg to inform you that the work was during the rainy season here and there to guard the weak portions of the bund from being breached when heavy freshes came to the tank and I had to guard the bund from one end to the other and the measurements were taken in haste here and there. I believed the cavalgars to measure the pits and entered in the book. As it is more than 6 or 7 months I am unable to identify the exact position of the pits.

Further I most humbly beg to say that I did not do anything wilfully, as slight difference is found here and there.

I beg &c
(signed) C. S. Hari Row
Tank Superintendent

14. f3

No 3442

Regd / to submit to the Executive Engineer Ramnad Division for orders with this office No 332 of 28 June 1888 calling on him to explain for the discrepancies.

This is another instance of his carelessness. My humble opinion is that he ought not to have been entrusted with such responsible duties. I allude more to his incapabilities than to his wilful neglect of duty.

However he has no excuse for not leaving his duty and keeping the measurements and accounts properly.

(signed) P. Subramania Iyer
Overseer D P W
2. 7. 88.

R.N.
2/259/88

C... ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION. 5 - DEC. 88

E 12

P.W. 129

The explanation of Hari Row will be sent on to the S. E. with my report on the subject. Hari Row having been strongly recommended by Mr Tangat he was kept on (after I discovered his uselessness in April) during the month of May as a last chance for him. He certainly would not have been entrusted with such work otherwise.

(signed) W. Dopp
Executive Engineer
10-7-88

(True copy)
(By order)

Accountant
Executive Engineer 12/7

Ho
12/7

6026

F4 15

8e
12/7

on him to explain for the discrepancies
This is another instance of his

$\frac{70217 \times 581}{195,806} = 208.$

581 - 208 = 37

$\frac{137,249 \times 619}{227,587} = 373$

619 - 373 = 24
61

Total R

B
13/7

Executive Engineer

Statement to accompany report on discrepancies found in the Earthwork measurements of C.S. Hari Row on the Ramnad tank

Year & month	As per measurement now taken	As per measurement sheet in support of bills paid	Payments actually made on Hari Row's bills			Stoppages			Remarks,
December 1887	70217	61,231	175	4	.	.	.	.	
January 1888		134575	405	12	8	.	.	.	
Total during Mr [illegible]	70217	195806	581	.	8	.	.	.	
February 1888	137,209	102492	275	.	.	32	8	6	
March 1888		115433	318	15	2	32	4	9	
April 1888		9662	25	.	.	3	15	9	
Total	137209	227587	618	15	2	68	13	.	
Grand total	207,426	423393	1199	15	10	68	13	.	
Add 10% for eddying	20742								
Total fair measurement	228168								
Gross quantity paid for in excess		195,225	Rupees			516	.	.	

423393
207426
215,967

1026

B
12/7

W. [illegible]
12-7-88
Executive Engineer

CH[illegible]NGINEER
17[illegible]
6-DEC.88
FOR IRRIGATION.

RN
1/259/88

E.11
RW 12/9[illegible]

8

No. 971RN

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE RAMNAD,
STATION.— Ramnad
Dated 11th July 1888

6026

FROM,

W. Jopp Esquire

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER RAMNAD DIVISION,

To,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE

SIR,

Enclosure. 1

Hari Row's explanation with the overseer's endorsement & statement.

In my inspection Notes of the 24th June 1888 I brought to your notice the inaccuracies that I have detected in C. S. Hari Row's measurements of earthwork done by him at a portion of the Ramnad tank improvements and promised to measure up the whole of the works carried out by this man and report the result to you.

2. I directed Overseer P. Subramania Iyer to measure up all of the late tank Supdt's work.

~~16~~ 17

3. The Overseer was unable to identify the pits with the entries in the tank Supdt's measurement book. He therefore measured each and every pit as they now stand.

16

4. The total quantity of work arrived at by the overseer is 207,426 c.ft while

the total given in the tank Supt's measurement book is 423393 cft.

5. About 1,95806 cft of the work measured by Hari Row was carried out in December 1887 and January 1888 during the incumbency of Mr Jarget and about 227587 cft in February and March & April/88 during my incumbency.

6. There have been a few thunderstorms but no continued rain since the pits were dug, so, I do not think we can allow more than 10 or 12% in addition to the Overseer's measurements on account of silting up or otherwise of the pits between the dates of two measurements.

7. We may then take the correct measurements of work done by Hari Row as 228168 cft * and cost Rs 685 against 423393 cft as measured up by him, a quantity of 195225 cft at a cost of Rs 516 having thus been paid for in excess.

* Please statement herewith

8. I have myself carefully check-measured all the Overseer's measurements and have found that he has given the tank Supdt the benefit of every doubt. Then at one portion of the work, at a beach at the northern end of the tank, where many pits have quite obviously been made up in the hollow places scoured out by the water and again where loose sand has been obviously shovelled from the centre of the pits to the side to make banks, the overseer has

measured

measured up the pits as if they were actually dug.

1026

At this portion, Hari Row's measurements come to 177132 cft, the Overseer's to 90476 cft and measurements obtained from the actual bank itself to 56000 cft. I think the last is probably the most correct but I have accepted the Overseer's measurements.

9. It is obvious that not only were the lengths, breadths and depths of the pits entered in the tank supdt's book different from those of the actual pits but he also allowed the grossest cases of cheating to go on and ~~that~~ he must have known of them.

10. There is no excuse for him as the work was within 5 miles of Ramnad and he is even himself able to make no reasonable explanation. A copy of his explanation with the present Overseer's endorsement is herewith sent.

11. As already stated 227,587 cft of work were billed for by Hari Row during my incumbency and I paid for the quantity as billed for by him less 10%.

12. The work was carried out and billed for in February and March. During

March and April I was absent from Ramnad. During month of May I was a few days in Ramnad but as Hari Row was the whole and every day occupied in preparing the Palace at that place for the Minor Zemindar's wedding I was unable to take him away to measure up this work. Immediately on my return from camp in June I took steps to measure up the work which results in this report.

13. Although however I was unable to measure it up myself until then, I gave written orders to Supervisor Murugesam Pillay to measure it up in April.

This however he did not do as I believe, his health would not admit of it.

14. Under these circumstances I have to request that I may be relieved of all responsibility or blame on account of the excess payment made during my incumbency and to point out again as I did in my transfer report on taking over charge of the Division that it is impossible for —

for

measured

for the Executive Engineer unaided by assistants to exercise sufficient check on works in progress throughout the Division.

D 26

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

W. Dopp

12-7-88

Executive Engineer

E
11/7

Init
11/7

SUPDG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 259 R.N.
16 JUL 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE

Register No. Dated

Reference No. Dated

FROM,

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
RAMNAD DIVISION.

To,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE,

CHIEF ENGINEER
No. 1771
5 DEC 88
FOR IRRIGATION

No. 971 RN

Dated 11 } July 1888
Received } 12/7

Enclosure. 2

Ramnad tank – Reporting the discrepancies in the measurements of earthwork done by tank Superintendent C. S. Hari Rau in the

Reference sent No. 20C 20-7-88. RN. dated

Reply No.

No. 1753 RN

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE RAMNAD,
STATION.—Rajasingamangalam
Dated 28 September 1888.
despd 28/9

1026

FROM,

W. Joff Esqre.
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER RAMNAD DIVISION,

To,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE

SIR,

Enclosure.. Nil—

In reply to your letter No 20C of 20-7-88 I have the honor to offer the following explanations;

Para 2 of your letter.

The figures given by you agree with my statement, omitting the additions of 10 per cent made by me. The remarks made by me in para 8 of my letter No 971 of 11-7-88 are matter of opinion, but as I did not see the site before the pits were dug, I determined to adhere to the measurements given by the Overseer.

Para 3 of your letter.

By my calculations the amount of over-payment omitting the 10 per cent additions which I made in the Overseer's measurements is.

(1) By Mr Pargiter Rupees 373. (581-208)

14 20

(2) By myself Rupees 202; arrived at thus, the actual quantity of work done is 137209 cft and the value of it to Government is Rupees 412 (at Rs 3 per 1000 the rate at which the work is valued

in the bill) The actual payment was 614* Rupees thus the excess payment is Rupees 207 (614-412)

The work people having already been paid in excess, the stoppages need not be disbursed.

(3) The total loss to Government would therefore be Rupees 575 (373+207).

*In the original statement it was given as Rs 618-15-2 as there was however an error of Rs 4-15-2 which reduces the amount to Rs 614 – Please correct original statement.

Paras 4. 5. 6 of your letter.

In explanation of your remarks as in the margin, I have the honor to state that I *did* direct Supervisor Murugasam Pillay to check these measurements but he failed to do so.

"You were quite wrong in making payments on the measurement of a temporary employe' without these having been checked by a responsible Subordinate, and therefore that you are responsible".

2. The circumstances were these:

The work under question was carried out chiefly in February and the beginning of March. I took charge of the Division on the 16th of February and had scarcely time to become well acquainted with the Subordinates, or the nature, position or even the names of different works in the Division before these transactions occurred.

3. C. S. Hari Row was granted casual leave on the 29th of February and I directed Supervisor Murugasam Pillay to take charge of his works during his absence.

4. The Supervisor in his letter No 502 of the 4th of March 1888 reported the inspection of a work which he called "breach closing work at the north end of Ramnad tank ✕ and remarked that it appeared that the work people were cheating.

✕ "The real name being "Improvements to the Ramnad large tank"

5. I immediately wrote back to the Supervisor an urgent letter No 2702 of the 5th of March directing him to report the correct measurements of the pits and the names of piece-workers &ca.

6. To this letter, I have never received reply.

1026

7. This incident having occurred so early during my incumbency, there having been so many irregularities to deal with, my experience of the division and of the works in progress, having only just joined, being practically nil, my having travelled to a distance from ~~the site of the work~~ headquarters, will I think give sufficient cause for its having escaped my memory when the bills and measurement sheets were received from the Division office checked, attested and passed for payment by the Divisional Accountant.

8. Had the Supervisor measured up the pits as he was directed or the division office brought to notice his neglect in doing so or the division Accountant the impropriety of making payments on Hari Row's measurements and all of these might have been reasonably expected from a fairly efficient staff, the payments would certainly never have been made.

21

20

9. In further explanation of my having made payments on the measurements of Hari Row and of the Accountant having

attested the bill &c, I beg to say that this procedure, ~~was~~ is in existance in my predecessor's time, had never been taken exception to by the Examiner or any one else.

9. S. Hari Row having been appointed on high Salary on the strong recommendation of Mr Target as to his honesty, Solvency and Social position, and having been for sometime a cash disburser, the impression was that his measurements might be accepted with the usual deductions, as in the case of temporary Overseers of the Division without any lien on a permanent appointment. There does not appear to be any more hold over one of these than there was over Hari Row.

10. Finally I beg to say that this division has been in utter disorganization judged by the ordinary P.W rules. It can scarcely be expected that every irregularity could be discovered and adjusted within a few weeks of my taking charge of the division or even when discovered, of their being rectified then and there.

Para 7 of your letter.

I have no evidence at present to prove criminal attempt ~~to~~ cheat on the part of Hari Row still he must of course have been

fully

fully aware that the measurements in support of his bills were incorrect and therefore that the bills themselves were incorrect.

12. This reply has been delayed in order that I might report whether it would be possible to recover the excess payments made during my incumbency.

13 Having found the whereabouts of the different piece workers I caused registered letters to be served on them – directing them to appear on a certain day in order to point out their pits.

14. The names of the men and amounts paid to them are noted in the margin.

Names of Pieceworkers	Amount paid
Kalimoothoo Pillai	235
Moothoosawmy Pillai	26
Cunarama Pillay	25
Colia Cattan	328
	614

(1) On the day appointed – Piece worker Kalimoothoo Pillay appeared and pointed out pits which he claimed as his own and the measurements of these shewed that he had been paid Rs 52 in excess;–

(2) Piece worker Moothoosawmy Pillay did not appear but afterwards in conversation with the Overseer informed him that as his pits were dug more than a year ago he could not point them out – This statement is of course untrue – As the pits were dug if at all, in the month of February little more than 6 months ago and as no rain has fallen in the interval should be easy

of identification

(3) Piece worker Sivarama Pillay did not appear at all.

(4) Piece worker Selia Cothan, refused to accept the registered letter which is now in my possession and he did not appear.

Afterwards in conversation with the Overseer he asserted that his pits could not now be identified as they have lost their shape and that besides he had already received payment in full. Both of these statements are of course well known to him to be untrue.

15. These men are all aware that their payments are subject to the correction of the Executive Engineer on his inspection and as they have refused (except Kalimoothu Pillai) to put in an appearance to point out their work I presume that I may myself fix the amount of work carried out by each one of them and forfeit any sums of money now due to them to meet the excess payment made. Exclusive of 10 percent deductions, shewn as due to these men in the bills on which excess payment were made, the following sums are due to them –

Kalimoothu Pillay – Improvements to Ramnad tank.

Rs 187-8-0

Excess only Rs 52
vide para 14(1)
see also para

Rs 187-8-0

Muthusawmy Pillay " " "

Sivarama Pillay " " "

Selia Cothan Impts to Ramnad large tank 68-"-"

Total Rupees 255-8-"

16. It will thus be seen that there is a sum of Rs 255-8-" at my disposal from which to recover the over payment of Rs 207.

Permission is requested to forfeit and credit to the work from

Kalimoothoo Pillay's bill	Rs 139.
Selia Cothan's bill	Rs 68.
Total Rupees.	207.

17. Although Kalimoothoo Pillay did put in an appearance, it is clearly shewn that he was dishonest enough to receive a cheque for an amount far in excess of what he must have known was due to him. We cannot therefore in the absence of the other piece workers whose pits he may have claimed as his own, trust to his sense of honesty sufficiently, to admit that he did shew his own pits and not some other man's. I propose therefore to recover Rs 139 from him although on his own shewing he was paid only Rs 52. in excess

Selia Cothan is merely a laborer and has no property to attach so it would be useless to take out a civil suit against him ~~for~~ to recover anything in addition to Rs 68 due to him.

There is a sum of money (Rs 84-13-1) due to piece-worker Muthusawmy Pillay for work done in emergent repairs to the Palace at Ramnad but as the excess payment to him can only be small, and as he has a partner in that work and it would, I understand, necessitate a civil suit before we could recover anything from this amount, I propose to omit taking steps to recover anything from him.

x Emergent — to the Palace Ra

19. If the Superintending Engineer approves of my recovering the amount from Kalimoothoo Pillai and Selia Cothan as above, it will be done. It does not seem that they could take any action against the department for recovery of the amounts forfeited with chance of success.

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

27/9

Executive Engineer

1026

~~23~~
24

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE RAMNAD,

to take out a civil suit agai

Register No

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 448 RN.
1 OCT 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE.

Reference 20-7-88 No 20c dated

CHIEF ENGINEER
No. 17
5 DEC 88
FOR IRRIGATION.

From

W. Jopp Esqre
Executive Engineer
Ramnad Division

To

The Superintending Engineer
VI Circle

No 1753 RN.

dated 28-9-88

Recd.

Enclosure — Nil —

Ramnad Large Tank

Affording further information regarding the payments in the —

Reference Sent No 355 RN dated 6-10-88 to E.E. No 12 Periyar Dn

---

No. 1971 RN

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE RAMNAD,

STATION.— Ramnad

Dated 22nd October 1888

W26

FROM,

W. Jopp Esquire

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER RAMNAD DIVISION,

TO,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE

Enclosure. nil

SIR,

In reply to your letter No 347 R.W. of 13-10-88 I have the honor to say that Rs 68 is the amount shown in the books of this Division as due to Sela Cotton (Thevan) and is the amount I proposed to forfeit to meet the excess payments made to him on the Ramnad tank improvements.

2. Rs 66 is the amount claimed by the man himself as due to him in his petition to you.

3. I propose the forfeiture of the money on the principle that it is necessary for the man himself to prove that he did the work. This principle, I believe is generally accepted in the department, but in this case the man not only refused to go to

the work site to prove his work ~~but~~ admitted (verbally) that he could not do so.

4. In this case, it, is, I conclude within the legal powers of the Executive Engineer to fix in the best way he can —— the quantity of work actually turned out by the man, and to make recoveries from him on account of any payments found to have been made to him in excess.

5. At the enquiry the pieceworker Kalimuthu Pillai appeared and pointed pits which he stated, were his.

6. The measurements of these pits showed that he had been paid Rs 52 in excess.

7. The total amount paid in excess by me was Rs 207. Then it would be fair supposing that Kalimuthu Pillai pointed out only his own pits, to assume that Rs 207 — 52 = Rs 155 is the amount of excess payment made to Selia cothen the other pieceworkers who did not appear.

8. In a court of law, therefore I fancy that a suit against Selia cothen for Rs 155 would stand but I have no one to consult here on the point.

3 names given
in Mr [illegible]
report
in addition to
Kalimuthu Py
but see below

9. I have omitted to take into consideration the other two pieceworkers Muthusamy Pillay and Swarama Pillay as the quantities of work that they did and were paid for, were very petty and

and any excess payments to them would therefore be insignificant.

10. In my report No 1753 of 27-9-88 I requested permission to forfeit from

Kalimuthu Pillay Rs 139 }
Selia cothen Rs 68 } Rs 207.

10 28

on the grounds stated in para 16 of that report, but you would perhaps approve of forfeiting from the balances due to them as follow~~ing~~

Kalimuthu Pillai Rs 52
Selia cothen — Rs 68.

and to take action against Selia cothen for the balance of excess payments made to him namely Rs 87 (Rs 155 — 68). He may have effect to that value.

11. With reference to the last sentence in your letter I beg to say as already pointed out in para 12 of my report No 1753 of 27-9-88 that these enquiries were instituted only with reference to over payments made by myself and not by Mr Target.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant,
J. Dopp
23-10-88
Executive Engineer

~~25~~

26

22/10

23/10.

SUPDG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE No. 5233 RN 26 OCT. 88 P.W.D. SIXTH CIRCLE

Register No. Dated

Reference No. 347 RN Dated 13—10—88

FROM,

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
RAMNAD DIVISION.

To,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE,

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION 5-DEC.88

No. 1971 RN

Dated 22 October 1888.
Received 23/10

Enclosure. nil

Pieceworkers [illegible]
and [illegible] —

Informing of the amounts to be recovered from the —&c—

Reference sent No. dated

Reply No.

Executive Engineer's office,
No. II Periar Division.
Camp-Mattaparai; 17th Oct/88.

No. 376

D/19

From

C. B. Target Esq.
Executive Engineer,
No. II Periar Division.

W2e

To

The Superintending Engineer,
Periar Project works.

Sir,

In reply to a letter[x] to my address from the Superintending Engineer, 6th Circle, for reasons obvious to you, I have the honor to forward you an explanation of apparent discrepancies.

[x] No 335 RN 6-10-88.

2 Hari Row has been to see me, and was on his way to Ramnad which, according to his statement, he only left after he had received a statement from the Overseer that his explanations subsequent to the letter sent were sufficient & returned to Erode owing to the sickness and death of his mother. 1 a

The pits at the Right (North?) end were scarcely begun when I went out in camp in January, & to secure labor, it was necessary that the payments should be made at once. I should have checked them on my return to Ramnad b

unemployment work during the rains —

2

Ramnad had I not given over charge, and I informed Mr. Jopp, that they had to be checked. c At the left end the only pits dug during my incumbency were at the clearance of the 11th Vent Sluice. The quantities can now be checked with the levels and cross sections taken before the work was begun; at this place Hari Row told me that the discharge of the water was such that he could not distinguish between the remnant of a pit & the old channel, when called on by Mr. Jopp. d This work I measured in the absence of Hari Row & found the total agree with his measurement; but all the pit workers were not present & the pits were claimed by the wrong men. So, as my detail measurement did not agree, I did not enter my remark on the bill (which I might have done to the effect that the total of 5 or 6 bills were correct) There was also emergent work done to save the tank during rains. The pits for this work were very irregular & taken wherever water was not standing & it was impossible to check them. e But from the damage done & repaired, I had no reason to suspect that more was paid for than should be, allowing for the circumstances.

3 I told Mr. Jopp that I believed Hari Row to be more truthful than most natives and I still think I am right. You are aware that I informed you of the state of the Division when I joined

and

and that with the want of roads (which prevented rapid travelling) and the untrustworthiness, from various causes, of all the Subordinates, that it was impossible to both carry out work and measure the whole before payment.

4 Before receiving a detailed proof, I cannot acknowledge that I overpaid any money except possibly at the right end where, I informed Mr. Jopp, I had not inspected.

10 2/6

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servt.

C B Target
Executive Engineer,
No. II Periar Division

2/8

~~2/6 A~~

8 1131 P.R
24-10-88

From C. B. Target Engr,
Executive Engineer
No. II Peria Dn.

To,
The Supdt Engineer
Peria Project Work

Dated 17
Despd 19 } October/88
Recd

No. 376

SG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 537 RN
31 OCT. 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S
3219 PC
5 NOV. 88

CHIEF ENGINEER
6 DEC. 88
IRRIGATION

5218
26-10-88

RN 1601/88

R. & N. 393 RN / 31-10-88 to E.E. RN

Overpayment in Ramnad Division –

Explains the ——

and repudiates the charge unless detail proof is adduced.

(826 to 991. P.R

Forwarded (in original) to the Supg Engineer VI circle.

2. With regard to para 3 of this letter. Mr Target remarks as to the state of the Division and the insufficiency of the establishment, and my replies thereto will be found on record in the office.

3 It should however be borne in mind that his difficulties were greatly increased by the removal (in consequence of orders from the Government of India) of the subordinates belonging to the permanent establishment; if my memory does not deceive me, I pointed out at the time the objections to this course and the impossibility of working a Division with none but temporary subordinates

Col RE
Supg Engr Periyar Project

Natchikulam
24 octr 88

CHIEF ENGINEER
No.
5-DEC.88
FOR IRRIGATION.

A

Name of work - Improvements to the bund of Ramnad Large Tank
Amount of Estimate Rs 15300
Name of task workers, Peria karuppan, Kury, Viraperumal
Palaniandy -
Date of measurement - 10-12-87

1026

Name of Task workers	Nature and Situation of work	Measurement in feet - No	L	B	D	Contents -	
Contingencies. **Periakaruppan**	Left hand side 3 arched bridge	1	22	21	3/4	346 1/2	
		1	36	18	1 1/2	972	
		1	36	21	1 1/2	1134	2452
abstract 2452 cft -	@ 2-14-0 per 1000			Rs		7-0-9-	
Kury -	In front of the breach to fill the breaches in the bund	1	33	30	3/4	742	
		1	15	9	1 1/2	202	
		1	36	24	1 1/2	1296	
		1	36	9	1 1/2	486	
		1	27	21	1 1/2	850	
		1	24	15	1 1/2	540	
		1	57	6	1 1/2	513	
	Big breach in bund -	1	60	18	1 1/4	1350	
		1	57	21	3/4	897	
		1	30	30	1	900	
		1	18	12	3/4	162	
							7938
abstract 7938 cft @ 2-14-0 per 1000				Rs		22-13-6.	
Veeraperumal	Right hand side 3 arched bridge	1	36	18	2	1296	
		1	30	24	3/4	540	
		1	24	18	1 1/2	648	
		2	24	15	1 1/2	1080	3564
		1	24	9	2	432	3996
Abstract 3996 cft of earth work @ 2-14-0 per 1000	do			Rs		11-7-9.	

Palanyandy

C.B.V. No. 69, 70, 71 & 71
December/87.

Left hand side

3 arched bridge	1	57	12	2 1/4	1458	
	1	39	15	2 1/4	1316	
	1	21	12	1/2	378	315

abstract 3152 cft. of Earthwork @ 2-14-0 per 1000 Rs 9-0-11-

Abstract

Periakaruppan

2452 cft. earthwork @ 2-14-0 per 1000 Rs 7-0-9-

Kury

7938 cft. of — do — @ Rs 2-14 per 1000 22-13-1-

Viraperumal

3996 cft. of earthwork @ 2-14-0 per 1000 11-7-9 ~~7-6-11~~

Palaniyandi

3152 cft. of Earth work @ Rs 2-14-0 per 1000 — 9-0-11

50-6-6

(Sd). C. S. Hari Rao
Tank Supdt
11-12-87

True Copy.
W. Jopp
13-1-88
Executive Engineer

No. 225 RN

Executive Engineer's Office Ramnad.

Name of work – Improvement to Ramnad Large Tank

Amount of estimate Rs 15300

Name of Task worker – Saliakottan 1026

Date of measurement (8-1-88) page no 26.

Nature & Situation of work	No.	L	B	D	Cubic yds Contents.
Emergent repairs to the eroded portions of the bund with pegs palmyrah leaves, Var, Bushes bag with earth:					
West of iron Vent Sluice	1	190 yards			
do of Achunnad madai	1	320 yards.			
East of Peyan madai	1	115 yards.			
from Thoni madai	1	100 yds.			
from Pillayar Koil to the east of palmyrah trees in the northern portion of the new bund	1	410 yds			
	1	56 yds			
do – do –	1	40 yds.			
do do —	1	45 yds.			
from old madai to temple	1	67 yds			
north of it	1	35 yds			
from Muthural road in the bund to Banyan tree	1	73 yds			
do Thaniy madai	1	170 yds.			
Total length	1521	× 3/4	× 1/2		cubic yds. 570 3/8
Total cyds					570 3/8

27 31

C.B.T. No 157

5703/8 cubic yards emergent repairs to the eroded portions of the bund in Ramnad Large Tank with pegs palmyra leaves, brushwood bag Earth &c Complete to protect the bund at [illegible] per cubic yard.

Rs. 213-14-3

/Sd/ C. S. Hare Rnd Tank Supdt
10-1-88

Check & pay in full. The excess rate for pegs & palmyrah leaves etc to be charged to Contingencies

Sd. C.B.T.
12-1-88

Abstract

not included in report No 1753

154.00 cyds Earthwork @ 3-4-6 per cyds Rs	50-8-0	
5703/8 cyds of repairs to bund with pegs palmyra leaves, brushwood &c &c @ Rs 0-4-7 per cyd Rs	163-6-3	
Total value of work done		213-14-3
Payments made by cheque No. 5R/2/537 of 18-1-88 Rs		213-14-3
Balance due to Contractor		0-0-0

(True copy)

W. Sopp
13-11-88
Executive Engineer

No. 2254 RN

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE RAMNAD,
STATION.— Ramnad
Dated 12th November 1888
desp'd 14/11

1026

FROM,

W. Sopp Esquire
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER RAMNAD DIVISION,

TO,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE

Enclosures three

SIR,

I have the honor as requested in your letter No. 393 RN of 31-10-88 to say that as far as I can ascertain, the only work which Mr. Target says he inspected before going into camp in January and which has been included in the statement accompanying my report No. 971 dated 11-7-88 is represented in the accompanying bills marked A & amounts in toto to Rs 50-66.

2 As regards Mr. Target's remarks in para two of his letter which I have subdivided for the sake of reference into a, b, c, d. e.

(a) It is not clear from the letter at what period the overseer is supposed to have signified his satisfaction with Harilowe's measurements

30 The overseer however now distinctly denies ever having done so.

~~30~~ 32

(6)

b- I cannot follow Mr. Sargets remarks in this portion of his letter as there seems some confusion between the right and left ends of the tank bund. Assuming the left end of the bund to be that end which is to one's left when facing in the direction in which water would flow over the surplus weir, then the right end will be the South end of the tank bund - whereas Mr. Sarget calls this right end the north end.

c- As to Mr. Sarget's having brought to my notice, the necessity for checking these pits at the time of his relief I have no recollection but whether he did so or not I of course could but consider it my duty to do so - As a matter of fact a very large portion of my time since I have been in the division has been occupied in checkmeasuring work done before my incumbency, - some of it very long before my incumbency. The result of my checking this particular work is as reported to the Superintending Engineer.

d. The pits dug near the 11 vent Sluice are apparently those shown in the enclosed bill marked A. Had it been

known

known that Mr. Sarget had checked this part of the work these bills would have been omitted from my report, but there was nothing in the measurement or note books from which this could be ascertained.

1028

e The emergent work referred to appears to be represented by the accompanying bill marked B - This also has been included in my report.

3 With Mr. Sargets third paragraph I entirely agree and have repeatedly brought it to notice; the first occasion being on the day I took over charge of the Division

By constantly travelling it is possible for the Executive Engineer to check measure the greater number of his works but as months must elapse between actual execution and the measurements it is not unlikely that he may err considerably either in one direction or the other in estimating the quantity or quality of work stated to have been done.

Mr Sargets letter is herewith returned.

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

37

37

W. Dott
13-11-88
Executive Engineer
[illegible] Division

13/11

13/11

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
601·RN
17 NOV 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE.

Register No. Dated

Reference No. 393 RN Dated 31-10-88

FROM,

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
RAMNAD DIVISION.

To,

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE,

No. 2254 RN

Dated 13-11-88

Received

Enclosure. Three - 3 -

Excess payment on
Ramnad large Tank.

Reports further on Mr. Target's letter No 376 d/17- october/88 regarding the —

Reference sent No. dated

Reply No.

1026

Letter from J. W. Rundall Esquire, Suptg: Engineer, 6th Circle to the Executive Engineer, Ramnad Division, dated 20th July 1888 No. 20.C.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your No. 971.R.N. of the 11th Instant reporting that over-measurements have been made on the Ramnad Tank Repairs by a temporary Superintendent one Hari Row, and that payments have been made on those measurements by the late Executive Engineer Mr Target and by yourself.

2. From the Statement you forward, it appears that work which according to Hari Row's measurements amounted to 423,393 cubic feet, the Overseer's measurements which have been checked by yourself and which you considered very liberal, amount only to 207,426 cubic feet, or in
34
35 other words Hari Row's measurements are more than double the actual amount of work done. You arbitrarily add 10 percent to the Overseer's measurements, for alleged silting of the pits; but in para

para 8 of your letter you state that the Overseer has included pits obviously made up, and that where he has measured 90,476 cubic feet you believe 56,000 c. feet would probably be the more correct quantity. I am therefore by no means disposed to admit that you are justified in adding 10 percent to the Overseer's measurements.

3. From the Statement you have prepared I gather the following facts:—

(1) That whereas 195,806 cubic feet of earthwork were paid for without deductions by Mr Target in December and January last, the Overseer's measurements checked by yourself amount to only 70,217 cubic feet, and as Mr Target paid Rs 581–0–8 for an enormous quantity, it follows that the amount of his overpayment is in round numbers, Rs 373 (581–208).

(2) That in February, March & April you paid Bills for 227,587 c. feet of earthwork, the current measurement of which, as checked by yourself, is only 137,209. As you deducted 10 per cent from the amount of

of the Temporary Superintendent's Bills, the overpayment by you amounts to Rs 246 in round numbers.

(3) The total loss to Govt is therefore 373 + 246 = Rs 619 and not Rs 518 as deduced by you.

4. Before reporting the matter for the orders of the Chief Engineer, I wish to know whether you have any remarks to make on my statement of the case.

5. As regards your being relieved from responsibility and blame in the matter, I have the honor to state that (in my opinion) you were quite wrong in making payments on the measurement of a temporary employé, without these having been checked by a responsible Subordinate, and therefore that you are responsible for the result.

6. As far as I can judge, Mr Target is more to blame than you, as he accepted this man's Bills without any attempt to check measure them, and without making any deductions.

7.

7. In replying to this letter please state whether, in your opinion, there is any chance of our being able to prove criminal attempt at cheating on the part of Hari Row. I do not suppose myself that it is likely we should succeed in convicting him, but I would like you to consider carefully whether there is sufficient proof to justify a prosecution being undertaken.

CHIEF ENGINEER
No. 9124
5-DEC.88
FOR IRRIGATION

(signed) J. W. Rundall
Suptg: Engineer
6th Circle

(True copy).

23-11-88
w/26.

Executive Engineer
in ch: of VI Circle

Cm

CHIEF ENGINEER
No.
5-DEC.88
FOR IRRIGATION

10 26

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
15 OCT.
P.W. DEPARTMENT MADRAS

To:

The Chief Engineer & Secretary to Government
Public works Department
Madras.

Most Honoured Sir,

The humble petition of
S. Mayakottan, Piece Worker, Ramnad,
Most respectfully showeth

That during the month of Dec. 87 as there was a heavy flood in the Ramnad big tank, the Dy Collector & Manager, Ramnad Estate, & the Executive Engineer took timely steps to let the water out, so that the adjacent villages attached to the Ramnad big tank might not incur destruction owing to the said flood through means of a new bywash newly dug for the purpose.

2. It elapsed a month to empty the excessive water through bye wash newly dug by me & the bywash measured 6 ft deep & 200 ft long.

3. The said flood devasted the road between Ramnad and Muthaloor to such a degree as would prevent the travellers & bandies for nearly 8 or 9 months.

4. After the said road, the breaches & the adjacent breaches attached to the Waste weir of the Ramnad big tank were supervised by the Head Asst Collector of this Division, he was ordered by the Executive Engineer

to ~~raise~~ the broken [illegible]ks & close the breaches of the
Road & ~~[illegible]~~ Nanal p[illegible]tation in the tank after the
tank is emptied.

5. ~~As~~ ordered by the Ex[illegible]e Engineer, he closed
the breaches of the muthabor [illegible] the Waste Weir, & thus
~~he was paid for the same~~ after a bill was passed.

6. He is to be paid Rs 40 for the mud work & 100 Rs
for the Nanal plantation & [illegible] was ordered by the
Supdt. Hari Row that he would be paid the balance
~~due to the Nanal plantat[illegible]~~ after it is grown only to
a full height. Rs 26

7. ~~He~~ made an applicatio[illegible] the Executive Engineer
in the begining of May 88 & requested him in person
to pass a bill for the Nanal newly grown. It was
2 or 3 times visited by the Supdt. Hari Row & the Executive
Engineer, to the petition he presented he received no reply

8. Then he requested the Talug overseer Supramania Iyer
Ag to pay him his balance due to him, he was ordered
to be present & the sum will be paid to him after the
works done from the begining are measured when he
represented him the fact, that it was impossible
show the works done in the Road & the breaches after long time
he was paid by the late Executive Engineer,
to which he was ordered that he will not be paid
unless the whole work is calculated

9 ~~[illegible]~~ the Oct 88, he made an ~~application~~ to the
Executive Engineer for the balance due to him
is to be paid, as ordered by the Executive Engineer,
he ~~was~~ presented himself in the office,

10. The Executive Engineer refused to pay him the
balance for the mud work & the Nanal plantation
unless a written order & the measurement for the
same are shown to him.

11. He is to be paid Rs 48 for the work of 1000 cft
of closing the breaches of the bunds; The work was
measured by the Executive Engineer & the overseer.

12. your honor might have been informed that it is unjust
to order him after 9 months to show the works after a
long period.

13. In obedience to this order he can only show the length
& the breadth of the tanks, but not the height of it.
it is, because, some [illegible]re in addition with the land
cultivated & some a[illegible] spoiled as the land is a saltish.

14. your honour is fu[illegible] aware that the Executive Engr
refuses to pay him the b[illegible]nce with the hatred of
the Supdt. Hari Row after a long period is unjust
& a great loss to the poor pieceworker—

15. your honor might have been informed for the
Justice through the applications from Rajasingama[illegible]
& Muttukalatel. Talugs for the sum due to the
pieceworkers as the Ex. Engr ~~refuses~~ does not pay

35

them properly after the work is done. 10437

16. With reference to para — 10, for a written order, we are ~~[illegible]~~ written order for the works, ~~[illegible]~~ in the Ramnad palace for the Minor's marriage ~~[illegible]~~ were doing the work of Rs 500 having confidence upon the words of the Supdt Hart Row & the Executive Engineer. A copy of this is sent to the Supdg Engineer for justice.

17. In these circumstances, we humbly crave your honor's generosity to render him justice either coming on circuit or keeping the matter under a panchayet of the Dy Collector & Manager & thus protect the poor petitioner who is a contractor of 30 years service.

For which act of charity & kindness we shall as in duty bound ever pray.

[illegible] 88
Ramnad

Piece Worker

No. 3941 C of 17th October 1888

Transferred to the ptg: Engineer V Circle r disposal. It is quested that a copy the order passed on the case be forwarded to this office for information.

[illegible] Capt R.E.
Dy. Chief Engineer P.W.D.
16/10/88

1026

~~36~~

36 38

SUPDG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 502-RW
19 OCT. 88
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE.

CHIEF ENGINEER
No. 1774
5 - DEC. 88
FOR IRRIGATION.

From

The Chief Engineer
P. W. D.

E. I.
W. 12195
18

No. 3941. C. d/ 17th October /88

Alaga Kotten - Contractor Ramnad &c. - Forwards for disposal petition from - praying that the amount due to him for work done in repairing the Ramnad Large Tank may be paid him - & requesting to send a copy of the order passed on the petition.

Refce: Endt: No. 361 RW to / 18-10-88
E.W.

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Trichinopoly 28th November 1888.
Despd 26

No. 454 RW

11

From W. Hughes Esquire
offg The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

W 26

To

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation
thro' the Chief Engineer P. W. D

Sir,

I have the honor to submit for orders the enclosed Correspondence regarding an overpayment of Rs. 575 reported to have been made for work done in improving the Ramnad Large Tank.

ENCLOSURES. 5

Abstract from [illegible] Inspection [illegible]
x C. E.'s report 97 [illegible]
x 1783-RW / 28-7-88, x 171 / 22-10-88
x 2261 RW / 12-11-88
Copy of S.E.'s [illegible]
Solai Kotten's petition bearing Chief Engineer's endorsement
No. 3941 C / 17-10-88

x (To be kindly returned)

2. From December 1887 to April 1888 the works at Ramnad and in its neighbourhood were carried out under the supervision of the Division Officer assisted by a Tank Superintendent named Hari Row. On measurements submitted by this man Mr. Target paid Rs: 581-4-8 in December and January, and Mr. Jopp Rs: 618-15-2 in February to April. -

39
~~36~~
37

3. As Hari Row had been appointed on a high salary on the strong recommendation of Mr. Target who wished to have him made a Sub overseer on Rs. 40 in consideration of the numerous good qualities which

he was considered to possess. I do not think Mr. Dopp is much to be blamed for regarding him as in some sort holding the position of an overseer, and for placing some confidence in the opinion of Mr. Larget, illustrated as it was by the large payments made on the Superintendents bills. Mr. Dopp did not discover until April that the Superintendent was useless or until June that he was dishonest. –

4. The Code rules give no authority to make payments on bills prepared by men in the Tank Superintendent's position, but it is not easy to say how far the rules can be strictly enforced in a Division like Ramnad worked by a temporary staff. It appears to me that the Division Officer, unless he can check every work before paying for it, must accept some risks but whether Mr. Dopp has accepted more than was justifiable is for you to decide.

5. He took charge on the 16th February and was in camp the whole of March and April. During May he spent a few days at Ramnad, but did not then check the work as Hari Row was busily engaged on some urgent work at the Palace in preparation for the Zemindar's marriage. On his return from camp in June he, at once,

took

took steps to check the work, with the result that he found the pits shown in the measurement book so exaggerated in their dimen that they could not be identified. The result of measurements made as correctly as was possible after such a lapse of time showed that Mr. Larget had overpaid Rs: 373 and Mr. Dopp Rs: 202. Mr. Dopp had fortunately withheld 10 per cent from the bills which he paid. It will be noticed also that he had attempted to get the work checked by Supervisor Murugesa Pillai who reported on the 4th March (the Tank Superintendent being then on casual leave) that the work people were cheating. On the following day correct measurements were called for, but the supervisor sent no reply. Again in April the Supervisor was directed to check the measurements but failed to do so. This the Executive Engineer appears to excuse on the ground of the Supervisor's ill health at the time. Some suspicion had been aroused by the report of the 4th March, but it was against the work people not against Hari Row, and when the bills were subsequently received the incident had escaped Mr. Dopp's memory as he was engaged in dealing with various other irregularities.

6.

6. From Mr Targets explanation and the Executive Engineer's letter No 2254. R.N dated 12th November 1888 commenting on it, it appears that Mr: Target checked bills amounting to only Rs: 50 odd, and inspected work for Rs: 214, which he found it impossible to check, and considered there was no reason to sus:pect of being incorrectly measured. I believe Mr: Jopp to be exact and painstaking in his work and do not think he can be very far mistaken in his estimate of the overpayments. At the same time I do not mean to imply that there were any overpayments on the small portion of work actually check-measured by Mr: Target. It would appear from Mr: Jopp's report that he was unable to identify the work done by each man. This makes it impossible to enforce by legal proceedings the recovery of anything from these Piece workers, who have been paid in full since the amount of overpayment to individuals cannot be arrived at.

7 The Bills paid by Mr: Jopp himself to four Piece workers amount to Rs: 614 (vide his No 1753 R.N dated 28th Sep:tember 1888). On calling on the Piece workers to accompany him and point out the work, which they did, only one man, Kalimuthu Pillay, complied. The work, which he claimed to have done, on being measured, was found

to

to be less than paid for by Rs: 52. 3 There is a strong suspicion that this man claim:ed as his own work done by others, but since the others did not attend, and the man who measured the work, had been dismiss:ed, there is no proof that the overpayment in this case exceeded Rs: 52. Mr: Jopp

2 proposed to recover Rs. 139, but on what defensiable grounds I cannot see. Two of the Piece workers did only Rs: 51 worth of work between them, and as there is no money due them nothing can be recovered. The fourth man is Selia Kothen about whose claim I made a report to the Chief Engineer in my letter No 361. R.N dated 18th October 1888. If Kalimuthu Pillai was overpaid only Rs 52, the other men must have been overpaid Rs: 150, or nearly 40 percent of the Rs: 379 paid them. If the overpayments were equally distributed amongst the four they would amount to 33 per cent. It is pretty certain that Selia Kothen must therefore have been overpaid at least Rs: 108. the total payments to him being Rs: 328 – Rs: 66 is however all of his that there is in hand, and I think we must be content with this. The total recoveries, which can be made, are in my opinion

3	From Kalimuthu Pillai:	Rs: 52
	Selia Kothen	" 66
4	Salary for June due to Superintendent Hari Row	30
		Rs: 148

578
148
427

I.

8. I request permission to credit these amounts to the work and let whatever other overpayments have been made stand as a charge against the work.

9. The Executive Engineer reports that he has no evidence to prove a criminal attempt at cheating on the part of Hari Ram.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servant

W. Hughes
Offg: Superintending Engineer
IV Circle

4 P

W
No. 4793 C d/ 30th Novr. 1888

Forwarded.

Col: R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W.D.

Forwarded to W & I as I know nothing of the case
17/1/89

lc 2t

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE

No. 3941 C d/ 17.10.88
" 4793 C d/ 30.11.88
" 1523 W d/ 18.6.84
" 1067 W d/ 28.4.84
" 387 W d/ 13.2.84

From Offg
The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
for Irrigation
~~thro the Chief Engr P.W.D~~
Madras.

No. 454 Rw

Dated 23rd
desp 26th
Received } November 1888

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
23 NOV. 88
P. W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS

Enclosure. 7

Ramnad Large Tank

Submits for orders the enclosed correspondence regarding an over-payment of Rs 575 reported to have been made for work done in improving the —

C/ 1076

P. W. Dept.

6 P

Note by the Chief Engineer

Letter from the Supdg Engineer VI Circle No: 454 Rw dated 23rd Novr 1888.

In his letter above recorded the Supdg Engr. VI Circle brings to notice an overpayment of Rs 575 made on account of work done in improving the Ramnad Tank.

2. There is nothing to show when the work was begun but payments on account of it were made on the Tank Superintendent's measurements as follows:—

47

Rs 581-4-8 by Mr Sanger in Decr 1887 & January 1888.

47
43

Rs 618.15.2 by Mr Topps between Feby & April 1888.

3. It thus appears that a sum of Rs 1199.15.10 was paid away by the Executive Engineer without any check being exercised over the measurements submitted by the Tank Superintendent. This although ~~in~~ most irregu=lar is not the worst feature of the case which appears to be the fact that the work was allowed to go on four months with=out any check by the Divisional Officer.

4. Mr Topp joined the Division in Feby: 1888 and up to that time apparently the work had not been inspected and checked by Mr Laight as it should have been: Mr Topp should thereupon have at once attended to the matter and his excuse that he was absent in camp in March & April and that he endeavoured to get the work checked, that is ordered it to be checked by a Supervisor who failed to do so, cannot be accepted.

5 It was clearly Mr Topp's duty to have attended personally to the matter and had the check taken place in March there would probably have been no trouble or difficulty. Mr Topp however did not examine the work until June - six months after a payment of more than Rs 800 had been made on account of the work and for this he deserves

severe censure – Mr Tempest is also to blame for making so large a payment in the absence of ~~without~~ any check.

6. The Supt Engineer should at once see that the accounts of the work are put in order and report what loss has been incurred.

7. The undersigned recommends that the amount overpaid may be charged against the work.

[illegible] Col R.E.
Chief Engineer P.W. Dept.

F.B.
18/11/89.

12195 Nov. 18/1

This case is a bad one. 1028 I do not consider it so much because payments were made ~~by~~ on a Temp. Sub. ~~measurements~~ 1028 (which was of course irregular and against Code rules) but because the work was allowed to go on for months without any check.

There is nothing to show when the work was begun but R 581 was paid by Mr Tempest in ~~Dec~~ and R 618..15 in Feb & April Total R 1199 without any check whatever even by an Overseer 43

Mr Jobb joined Feby 88. The work ought to have been previously to this time been inspected & checked by Mr Tempest. but certainly Mr Jobb ought to have looked at it. His excuse that he was in camp in March & April cannot be accepted as that the [illegible] to get [illegible] checked that is evident it ought to be checked in March & April but [illegible] 43 It was his duty

accorded to the amount

Severe censure - Mr J

to have done so and
that it has done in
March probably there
would have been no trouble
or difficulty ~~but the~~
~~attempt to~~
It was not until June
that he examined the
work or more than 6
months since a payment
of more than R500 was
made and he thus
has shown serious censure

Draft G.O. pointing
out the ~~serious~~ loss there
occurred entirely by the
neglect of the Ex. Eng. in
allowing a work of this
sort to go on for more
than 6 months without
any check. Mr Tangye
was to blame for making
the large payment without
any check but Mr Jopp
was so in allowing such
serious delay in examining
the work
The ~~[illegible]~~ can't help any
be charged to the work but should
~~a similar case occur~~
~~Govt~~ Mr Jopp & Tangye allowing
a similar case to occur
Govt will make them responsible
for any loss
The S.E. for see the accounts are
all closed without delay

H.W.

A

No. 1731b

~~[illegible]~~
sent
~~Ecot~~

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

8 P

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the Jan 22. 1889

10 26

READ the following

From The Supt. Engineer Provl. writer ~~CW~~ Circle } (Ho. No. 454 K, dt 28 Nov 1888)

Note by the Chief Engineer Provl. P.W. Deptt. } (No. dt 18.1.89.)

The Government have perused the foregoing papers with regret.

2. The Supdg. Engineer will communicate to Messrs. Tangye and Jopp the displeasure of Government at their neglect of duty.

Wd 19 Jan

The man to hang seems to be Tangye not Jopp
Ns

~~44~~

3. On the recommendation of the Chief Engineer sanction is accorded to the amount

Afer 22

Mn

22/1/89

Overpaid being charged off to the work. The Supdg Engineer will at once check the accounts of the work and report the loss.

4. Should a similar case occur the Supdt. must hold the Ex: Engineer concerned personally responsible for any loss incurred through his negligence

18/1/89

H.H.

B 11/24

24/1

J.B.
18/1/89.

Nov 18. 189

S. E. ~~VI~~ Circle

Ex. Bd. A.

4/2

9

~~44~~ ~~45~~ 47

12195

Govt. of (1888) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

28/11/89

Dated

Recd.

Endt.

G.O. 22 Jany 1889 No. 1734

Ramnad Tank.

Directing the recovery of Rs 575 made on account of work done in improving the — to be written off to the works & censuring Messrs Target & Jopp for neglect of duty in connection therewith ~~in connection with the~~ as above.

40/3.

Order. 1026

His Excellency The Governor in Council has had under consideration the letter from Mr. W. Jopp Ex. Eng. in ch: Ramnad Division, appealing against the censure passed upon him conjointly with Mr Target in G.O. No 1734 d/ 22.1.89, and praying for a reconsideration of his case.

In the circumstances now brought to notice in Mr. Jopp's letter, His Excellency in Council is pleased to withdraw the censure conveyed in the G.O. in so far as it relates to Mr. Jopp, but he considers that, as is inferred from the note of the Acting Chief Engineer, the extent of the work that was being carried out on the Ramnad Tank should have attracted the Exe: Engr. attention and induced him to have made an early inspection of the work, when in all probability the errors committed by his predecessor could have been at once detected. 46 46 46

46 As the necessity for posting a Sub Divl Officer to the Ramnad Division has

the piece worker is prevented from

now been clearly shown, the Acting Chief Engineer will take early steps for having this done.

6.4.89

C.E. PW Dept.

1028

Stamped annual lights only

[illegible]

[illegible] 16 [illegible]

1888

[illegible] 25

[illegible]

25-12-88. (Signed)

(47)

V. Sivasawmy Sharma
Village Munsiff

(True copy)

accepted

47 49

S/D: T. Rajagopalachar
1st Grade Pleader

Department and the said Hari Row having left Ramnad for good, the piece worker is prevented from

1/73

Ramnad
25th December 1888

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
4 JAN.
P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS.

From

T. Rajagopala Char

First Grade Pleader

Ramnad

10 26

To

The Chief Engineer and Secretary to Government

Public Works Department

Madras.

Sir

Enclosing herein copy of Vakalat executed to me by one Selayakothan, a piece worker in the D.P.W. Ramnad Division, I have the honour to submit on his behalf that for the earth work turned out by him under orders in the Ramnad Tank up to last March, there stands still a balance of Rs 354 odd due to him from the Department as per the bill already submitted in due course by the late Tank Superintendent one Hari Row, on the 23rd March 1888 and partly paid for.

Enclosure: 1.

2 That for the work of Reeds plantation carried out by the same man in the innerslope of the same tank bund, the Department had to pay him a balance of Rs, 264 odd as per the bill already submitted by the same Hari Row.

3: That similarly the same Piece Worker also carried out Reeds-plantation at another site in the innerslope of the same tank bund at a cost of Rs 100, which being however was unsupported by any written order or bills from any officer of the Department and the said Hari Row having left Ramnad for good, the piece worker is prevented from

~~45~~ 4

~~48~~

from pressing his claims therefor with success.

4. That the same piece-worker has lately carried out earth work in the same tank at a cost of Rs 45 which has been also measured by the Overseer of the Taluq and the Executive Engineer, while the amount is not however paid to him up to date.

5. That the piece-worker duly represented the facts of his case to the Superintending Engineer by a petition, which on being referred to the Present Executive Engineer, Ramnad, has been however reported on by the latter unfavourably to the piece-worker, without bringing the real facts of the case to the Supdg Engineer's notice, meaning to shirk off the liability to the piece-worker on the useless excuse that he (The Executive Engineer) is not able to identify the pits now after a lapse of about 8 months since the works were finished, while in fact it cannot be denied that those pits situated on salty soil have since been silted & damaged by winds & rain, while the site being only 3 miles off the Hd Quarters of the Executive Engineer. ~~and~~ TR the works executed by the Piece Worker were also constantly inspected by the present and late Executive Engineers, both during their progress and after their completion.

6. The attempt therefore of the present Overseer who is quite new to the Taluq now to identify those works which were executed eight months ago under the orders of the Executive Engineer and constantly inspected by them, being therefore useless, the piece-worker declined ^(state) to shew him the pits and the works on account of which the balance is claimed.

7. In these circumstances I beg to point out for your special consideration the gratuitous assumption and deliberate misrepresentation of the present Executive Engineer to the Supg Engineer (Excuse me please for the candid expression) in reporting on the piece-worker's petition purporting to these words. The Piece-worker cannot prove the execution of his work entitling him to the balance claimed and the piece-worker admits that the plantation reeds referred to was only carried out by him to replant the nanals damaged.

8. In conclusion I request that you will be kindly pleased to order the final settlement of the Piece-Worker's accounts without further delay. I have just given the Collector of the District a formal notice under Section 424. Civil ~~Criminal~~ TR Procedure Code informing him that a suit will lie against the Government of India for the amount due to the Piece-Worker.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obdt Servant
T. Rajagopalachari
First Grade Pleader

25th Dec. 88
Ramnad

49

No. 52 C.D/ 8th Jany 1889

Transferred to
the Suptg. Engineer
VI circle for early
disposal.

(By order)

W. C. Baddeley

Capt. R.E.
Dy. Chief Engineer P.W.D.

7/1/89

S.W. C. No. 31

ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No 738 RN
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE

From

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Recd 1 - 89

$\frac{1}{2086/89}$

No. 52. C.D/ 8th January 1889

Enclos. 1

Forwarding for disposal
letter from T. Rajagopalachar
1st Grade Pleader Ramnad
requesting to order the final
settlement of the accounts
of Piece worker Saliya Kothen

Refce Sent No. ______

Transferred

C 26

OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
6TH CIRCLE.

Madura, 15th January 1889.
Despd 17th

No. 537 RN

From

Major D. McNeil Campbell R.E.
~~The~~ Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.

Thro The Chief Engineer for Irrign.

Sir,

ENCLOSURES. 1

With reference to your No. 52 C, dated 8th January 1889, transferring for early disposal petition from Saliya Kothen I have the honor to inform you that the claim therein referred to is the one reported in my predecessor's Nos. $\overset{\times}{\frac{361\ RN}{18\text{-}10\text{-}88}}$ & $\overset{\otimes}{\frac{454\ RN}{23\text{-}11\text{-}88}}$ and about which I await the orders of the Chief Engineer for Irrn.

× To the Ch: Engr.
P.W.D.

⊗ To The Chief Engr.
for Irrigation
thro E.W.

2. The petition is herewith returned for reference.

Papers sent C.E.I. on 18/12/88

[illegible] 24/1/89

3. I may mention ~~that~~ Mr. W. Hughes has, on receipt of a similar petition from the above individual, on the

50

~~[illegible]~~ 50 5

16 4

16th October /88, given the following Endorsement to him.

"The Contractor has offered no proof whatever that he did the work claimed for, and when questioned by the Executive Engineer stated that the planting which he did was in place of other work which had failed. In one of his petitions he stated that he had done the work in accordance with the revised estimate but on referring to the accounts it is found that all the work provided on the revised estimate has been done and paid for. Unless satisfactory proof can be furnished by the Contractor that he has done, with the knowledge or permission of the Exec: Engineer work which has not yet been measured no payment will be made. His mere assertion cannot be accepted".

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant.
D. McL Campbell Major R.E.
Supdt. Engineer W. Circle.

54 57

51

No. 15 E. W. 4/27-284

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, Public Works Department for disposal in continuation of this office endorsement dated 17th January 1889.

For Ag. Chief Engr. for I.
17.2

Were former papers sent to W. If so, say so " in continuation of 7C

21.2

Mch. 2086

P. W. D. 6TH CIRCLE.

CHIEF ENGR.
No. 6206
21 JAN. 89
FOR IRR.

From

The Superintending Engineer,
6th Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer
P.W.D.
Thro' the Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No. 537 RW

Dated 15th
Desp^d 17th } January 1889
Received 4/3/89

Enclosure. One 2

No. 1206-7 C. 4/9-3-89

Ramnad. Large tank.

Informs that the claim referred to in the endorsement No. 52C/8-1-89 is the one already reported in Nos. 361 RW/18-10-88 & 454 RW/23-11-88 respectively.

What is being done about the? I believe papers are with E.I. If so send them for disposal. W.E.I.

20.1

SAW

Sir 1026

CE has not initialled the endorsement to the S.E. VI Circle.

8/3/89

HC
never mind
Issue
570

S.E. 5 / XII

1026
C. Co. 2086

The E. I office endorsement referred to does not seem to have been received in this office.

M. E. I. — 6/3/89

Can you kindly give us the No. of your endorsement; we cannot find it here — S. P.

5-3-89

AM, m.s.

There is no number —
You will find it on one of your current nos. [illegible] 10
5/3/89

Recorded at foot of original No. 9793C of 30-11-88 — S. P.
1-3-89

No. 748 R.N.

Executive Engineer's office
Ramnad -
Dated: 14th March 1889 -

CO26

From.

W. Sopp Esquire
Executive Engineer
Ramnad Dn.

To

The Superintending Engineer
VI Circle.

Sir.

Encl. No. 3

In forwarding the statement regarding overpayment on Ramnad tank Improvements called for in your endorsement No. 589 R.N. of 6-2-89 on G. O. No. 173 W d/22-1-89 I have the honor to request that you will kindly consider the following remarks.

2. If you think, that had the circumstances now put forward, been known to the Chief Engineer previous to the passing of his note, printed with the G. O., I should not have been condemned for neglect of duty, I should feel much

obliged by your sending them on to him with any favourable remarks you may feel inclined to make.

3. I first reported on the overpayment in my letter No 971(a) of 11-7-88 to the Superintending Engineer and in para 14 of that asked him to relieve me of responsibility in connection with it.

The Superintending Engineer replied that he considered me to blame for having made payments on the measurements of tank Superintendent - C. S. Hari Rao.

The further explanation therefore that I offered in my letter No 1753 RW of 27-9-88 went merely to explain the reasons and necessities for my making payments on such measurements; - I gave no explanation and was not asked for any, as to why I did not check measure the work, immediately I took over charge. It is this point that the

Chief

Chief Engineer, vide para 3 of his note printed with G.O. No 173 W of 22-1-89, considers the worst feature of the case & for which he deems me deserving of severe censure.

5. The necessity for giving explanation on this point should of course have been apparent to me when writing my first report, and no doubt the omission to do so has led the chief Engineer to take a view of the case adverse to me.

I therefore hope, that the explanations I now offer, will be permitted and will not be considered uncalled for.

62

6. On taking over charge of the division I was not in the slightest degree aware, and I think I will satisfactorily show, that it was almost an impossibility for me to have found out that any earthwork remained to be checked measured on the Ramiat tank, and

that I therefore left Ramnad quite unconscious of the necessity.

7. Under the instructions contained in the P.W. Code, the relieved and relieving officers should inspect and check measure &c all work at head quarters; The late Executive Engineer and I were at Head quarters from the 10th to the 16th February, during which time the transfer was being carried out. We inspected certain works, but he did not inspect with me the Ramnad Tank, or point out any importance in connection with it. The verbal instructions and information afforded to me by the late Exe: Engineer regarding works at head-quarters were at the time noted by me in my note book. A true extract of them is put up with this; from which it will be observed, that the only information I was afforded regarding the Estimate "Improvements to Ramnad Large tank" was "work in progress". It should be borne in

in mind that this improvement estimate included a variety of items such as Nanal grass planting - new surplus weir and repairs to masonry works besides earthwork. (W2)

Being quite new to the division, and also the relieving officer, I had of course at first to be guided by the information supplied by the relieved officer; and I had no reason to suspect that there were any omissions of prominent points. That such omissions should become apparent only after some lapse of time is I think only to be expected and is what actually occurred.

8. Further under the same code rules, the relieved officer should have supplied me with a written statement of such points as required my immediate attention, and in which I take it such a duty as checkmeasuring work on a tank at head quarters on which an expenditure of Rs 581 had been actually made, without his check

would of necessity have found a place. I received no such statement or any intimation to that effect.

9 Moreover, it is usual, when making payments on the measurements of a Subordinate, to make certain deductions from their bills, until the measurements are checked.

These deductions are then shown as balances due to pieceworkers, in the pieceworkers Schedule, to which the executive Engineer has to give his attention with a view to paying off the balances after final inspection.

In case of this earthwork on Ramnad Tank, even this possibility of my discovering from the accounts that there was work to be checked, was not afforded me, as all the payments had been made in full, and no arrears appeared in the accounts.

10. Under these Circumstances, viz not having been taken by the relieved officer to inspect this work (one of those near to head quarters), not having received any intimation from him of the necessity of check measurement or of the absence of check measurement for so long a time either verbally or in writing, and from the want 102b of anything on record
102b
in my office from which to ascertain it, (when the original Estimate, plans, and measurement books were all with the Subordinate), I beg that you will Consider whether I can be fairly blamed, for having left Head quarters without having discovered the necessity for the check measurement.

11. That I performed my duties as laid down in the Code in taking over charge of a division to the best of my abilities and knowledge, will I think be borne out by a reference
59 to my inspection notes filed in your
62 office. 62

So then it will be found that I

actually twice inspected and reported on the different works on this Ramnad tank before leaving head quarters for Circuit

12. Had the slightest intimation been given me or had the slightest intimation existed in the records in the office of the necessity of check, or even of the fact that *earthwork* had been in progress during the *previous* months, (the rainy months when the work is usually at a standstill), there is not a doubt in my mind that I should have checked it before leaving for camp, and I think that any possible doubt in your mind will also be removed by a perusal of the measurement books, note books, and other records, showing what I have done in this very way of clearing off arrears at the greatest discomfort and inconvenience to myself.

Thus as regards the checkmeasurement of work done during my incumbency

incumbency I beg to represent that every possible step was taken

13- It was for the most part paid for in the month of March and April/88, less the usual deductions. As already explained, every endeavour was made to verify the Subordinate's measurements, first by deputing a Supervisor in March and again in April during my absence in camp at a distance, there being no Sub-divisional officer; and it was finally checkmeasured by me personally in the month of June/88: that is there had not been a lapse of 3 months during which to my knowledge work remained without check-measurement.

1026

14 Further, had it not been for the reason previously given namely, the inability of the Subordinate to leave his emergent duties in preparation for the Minor Zemindar's

~~13~~ ~~[illegible]~~ 6

wedding, the check measurement by me would have taken place in the month of May, not two months subsequent to my knowledge of the work having been carried out or paid for.

15. If therefore my explanation for not having check measured the work done during Mr Tarjets incumbency before leaving Ramnad for Camp is considered satisfactory, I think that it will also be conceded, that no undue delay was allowed, in checking work done during my incumbency, & no possible precaution omitted by me.

16 In para 4 of the chief Engineer's note printed with the G. O it appears to be understood that I was aware on taking over charge that work had been carried out and remained unchecked since Dec 87 or nearly 3 months previously.

I hope under the explanation

given

given that it will be clear, that I was not aware of it, and that there was no means of my ascertaining it; that I was aware only in the months of March & April/88, that work carried out during those months, remained to be check-measured, and it was in check-measuring this, that I for the first time discovered that work done previous to my incumbency had not been checked. No 21

17. On endeavouring with the Subordinate to check measure this work of mine, I was unable to identify the pits with the measurements entered in his measurement book. I therefore measured up all work done by him, part of which had been done in my predecessors time, and part in mine, so that some check might be exercised by means of totals.

It was then (June) that I came to learn that work carried out in the time of my predecessor, had nothing on record to show that check-measurements had been made by him, and it was thus the necessity arose for reporting it.

18. As the explanations already given may not explain some of the remarks made in the Chief Engineers Note printed in the G.O. No 173 W. of 22-1-89, I respectfully beg to offer the following explanations against each one of them in detail.

Para 1 & 2 of the Chief Engineer's Note

The overpayment will be as follows.

During Mr Targets time Rs 372-9-4
During my time (if the recoveries recommended by the Supdg Engineer are sanctioned) Rs 54-—

Net total overpayment Rs 427-(about)

The work was begun in June 1886, & at the time I took charge the tank was full of water.

P.T.O.

---

water.

Para 3 of the Chief Engineer's Note as in the Margin.*

* It thus appears that a sum of Rs 1199-15-10 was paid away by the Executive Engineer without any check being exercised over the measurements submitted by the tank Superintendent. This although most irregular is not the worst feature of the case which appears to be the fact that the work was allowed to go on for months without any ~~[illegible]~~ check by the divisional officer.

(p 26

I have already explained that I was totally unaware that work done during my predecessor's time was unchecked, until I came to check work done under my own control; that my being unavoidably absent in camp and no Subdivisional officer being afforded, endeavour was made to obtain check of work in progress during my time by the Senior Subordinate in the Division, a Supervisor; that to my knowledge work had not been in progress more than 2 months without an attempt at personal check and more than 3 months without that check. Work was only actually in progress for two months during my incumbency.

62

Para 4 of Chief Engineer's Note (as in the ~~mar~~ margin)*

65 62

* Mr Sopp joined the division in Feb. 88 and up to that time apparently ~~that~~ work had not been inspected and checked

The check measurement of work done during Mr Targets' time would most certainly have been carried.

carried out before my leaving for camp had it been known that unchecked work existed and a full explanation of the circumstances, has already been given in previous paras of this letter, shewing that it was scarcely within possibility that I could have known it.

My absence in camp was not for a moment pleaded as an excuse for not having done so; the work done during my incumbency was done while I was in camp and it was for not having immediately checked this, that I gave my absence in camp as a reason.

So also the Supervisor was never ordered by me to check measure work done in the previous Exec Engr's time; I did not then know that such unchecked work existed; the Supervisor was ordered to check work which was at that time in progress while I was in charge.

Para 5 of Chief Engineer's memo. as in the margin —

I have already given a clear explanation

checked by Mr Sa as it should have been. Mr Sapp should therefore have at once attended to the matter, and his excuse that he was absent in camp in March & April, and that he endeavoured to get the work checked, that is, ordered it to be checked by a supervisor who failed to do so, cannot be accepted.

* It was clearly Mr Sapp's duty to have attended personally to the matter

ed had the check taken place in March there would probably have been no trouble or difficulty. Mr Sapp however did not examine the work until some six months after a payment of more than Rs 500 had been made on account of the work and for this he deserves severe censure. Mr Sarget is also to blame for making so large a payment in the absence of any check.

as to how I was not informed, and was not afforded even the slightest clue, to enable me to ascertain that unchecked work existed on my taking over charge; that seeing from the very day I took over charge my energies have been devoted to clearing off such arrears as may be supported by the accounts, measurement and note books, of the division, chiefly in most out of the way places; it is quite incredible, had I known of the necessity, that I should have left

1026

head quarters without first attending to it, one of the chief objects of my leaving head quarters so soon after joining, being to check measure works long left in arrears

Again, my having omitted to check my predecessor's unchecked work immediately on taking over charge, can scarcely be said to be the cause of all this trouble. The cause existed before I took charge. Had I checked the work immediately

~~68~~ 63 ~~66~~

I took charge, the same excess payment made in my predecessor's time would have been discovered and reported and have caused the same trouble.

The subsequent excess payment, that is the net excess payment, during my time, is Rs 54 only, which compared to the amount of the Estimate Rs 21550 is trivial.

× If the recov-ies indicated by the Supt'g Engineer are sanctioned

Had I with knowledge, left head quarters without checking the unchecked work of my predecessor I would undoubtedly have been wrong; but I beg to represent that even supposing for a moment that I did so, this act of mine resulted in a loss of only Rs 54; the previous overpayment of Rs 372 in my predecessor's time being quite beyond my control and quite irrecoverable, payments having been made by him in full to petty piece workers.

Para-19

19. I regret not having given the above reasons regarding inspection of work in my first report on the subject. The explanation given there, as already pointed out, referred only to the making of payments on the measurements of the Tank Supdt C. Hari Rao-

1026

I almost venture to hope, that if consideration be given to the remarks of the Suptg. Engineer in his letter No 454 RN of 23-11-88, printed with the G O, as also to the state of the division at the time of my taking over charge, such a favourable view of the case may be taken, as will result in withdrawal of any blame on this point also.

1026

~~67~~ 64

20. In his letter No 454 RN of 23-11-88 the Suptg. Engineer remarks "I do not think Mr. Sopp is much to be blamed, for regarding him (C. Hari Rao) as in some sort holding the position

of an overseer &c" and again in para 4 "The Code gives no authority to make payments on bills prepared by men in the tank Superintendents position, but it is not easy to say how far the rules can be strictly enforced in a division like Ramnad worked by a temporary Staff". I would also beg to draw attention to the explanations I gave in my letter No 1763 RN / 27-7-88 to the Supdtg. Engineer.

21 And again regarding the state of the division.

The Grant of the division for the year 1888-89 was Rs 150000; the expenditure against this at the end of January/88, was Rs 63000 (about), thus leaving a balance of about Rs 87000 to be spent, while works were almost at a stand still, and only two months remained in the year.

22. Heavy payments had in my predecessors time been made on many works, of which there had been no check measurements for many months, (several being on the measurements of the Irrigation Superintendent C. S. Hari Row), as will be seen in the table in the margin.

1026

Statement showing the period that had elapsed since last check measurement of the major works of the division at time of my taking charge and the amounts that had been paid in each since that check.

Names of works	Date of inspection previous to my taking charge of division	Months since last inspection	Payments since last inspection	Approximate distances from Ramnad
Mookulam tank Improvement	21-7-87	7	3476-12-5	42 miles west
Kalary tank — do —	24-7-87	4	733-9-5	9 miles South
Rajasingamangalam tank do	27-6-87	8½	6857-14-3	21 miles North
Ramnad tank Improvements	8-7-87	5	3304-0-11	1 to 3 miles
Regunadacavery channel	20-9-87	4	291-3-4	30 miles South
Repr to Eclale chattram &c Muthuramalingapuram	24-6-87	7	1904-5-4	30 miles North
Improvements to Kattipudy tank	25-6-87	7	104-1-2	30 miles North

The inspection of all, or even many of these by me in the two remaining months of the year, to satisfy myself that previous payments had been correctly made before making others on my own responsibility would have been, I think, almost an impossibility. I immediately took steps to carry out such checks, but seeing the state of expenditure against grant, and that the system of working the division, that is of making payment on works although they had not been checked for long periods, (also on the measurements of the Irrigation Superintendent without che

1026

68

been in force without objection for so long, I should not I think, have been justified, immediately on my taking charge and at that late period of the year, in altering that — System and refusing payments until I had satisfied myself by personal inspection that previous payment had been made on Correct measurements &c.

Had I done so the greater part of the work in the division would have been brought to a stand still and the effect on the expenditure of the division would have been disastrous.

23. At the time of taking over charge of the division I foresaw this difficulty in the matter of check measurements. and on my transfer report distinctly noted (a copy of the remarks is sent with this) that it is impossible for the Executive Engineer, unaided by a Sub Divisional officer, to satisfy — himself of the Correctness of measurements & of bills of Contractors and others

others. The Supdg Engineers opinion is also recorded on this transfer report to the effect that a Sub Divisional — officer was necessary but no assistance was accorded.

102 B

I have also on ~~Subject &c~~ Subsequent occasions pointed out to the late Supdg Engineer Mr Rundall that the assistance of a Sub Divisional officer was absolutely necessary for the efficient working of the — division and I understand that he recommended the appointment of such an officer.

24. I hope the explanations now given will be held sufficient to clear me of the blame and — respectfully request that the withdrawal of the censure passed on me in the G. O. No 173 W of 22-1-09 be Considered.

69

VX ~~64~~ 66

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt Servant

W. Copp
14-3-09
Execve Engineer
Cauvery Dn

13/3   13/3

7036

10206

67

70

PWC No 3074

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No 911 RN
16 MAR 89
P.W.D.
SIXTH CIRCLE

Enclo 3.

R: 687

Submitted to the Chief Engineer for favorable consideration.

30 March 1889. W. Hughes
Desp'd 30th. Supg Engr 6th Circle

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
-1 APR. 89
P.W. DEPARTMENT, MADRAS.

From

E. W. Jopp Esquire
Exec. Engineer
Ramnad Dn.

To

The Superintending Engr.
VI Circle

No 748 RW

Dated 14th } March 1889
Recd 2.4.89 }
Desp'd 14th }

Enclo — Three — 3 —

memo No 1206-7 C of 9.3.89
Pro. Aus 178 W of 22-1
memo No 52 C of 8-1-89
memo No 4793 C of 30.11.88
" " 4055 C of 23.10.88
" " 3941 C of 17.10.88
Pro. Aus 1523 W of 18.6.84
" " 1067 W of 26.4.84

1/4/89

Furnishing further explanation regarding overpayment on the — for reconsideration

R. S. No 687 RW to E. W.
30.3.89.
Omer

1026

I think the censure passed on Mr Jopp may be rescinded under the circumstances brought to notice in his letter of appeal, in the hope that what has occurred may prove to him a salutary lesson, and show the necessity of keeping a careful check over works carried out by subordinates who either ~~[illegible]~~ from want of experience or inferior grading in the Department require to be more closely supervised.

The necessity of having a Sub Divisional Officer to assist the Ex. Engr. in check measuring the works in the Ramnad Division is, I think, clearly shown in Mr Jopp's letter, and was recognised by the late Supg. Engineer Mr J. W. Rundall —

T.B.
73/H

Rhodes
2.4.89

---

ort on relief of Mr Jargel

Short on relief of Mr Target

69 1026

Mr. W. Jopp. Ex. Eng.
Ramnad Divn. submits a letter dated 14th ult. through the S.E. VI Circle appealing against the censure passed upon him (conjointly with his predecessor Mr. Target) in G.O. N. 173 W of 22.1.89.

His argument is founded on the fact that when he relieved Mr. Target that Officer did not inform him that work on the Ramnad Tank already paid for had not been checked - The remarks taken down in Mr Jopp's note book on information given him by Mr. Target wrote, "Work in progress. This work ~~was~~ is situated from 3 to 7 miles distance from Ramnad, and looking to the amount of the estimate for the repair of this Tank and its masonry works, viz. Rs 21550 Mr Jopp's tour of inspection should necessarily have commenced with this Tank. The work was under a ~~Petty~~ Subordinate ranking as a 2nd grade Sub Overseer in respect of this ~~[illegible]~~ Tank he drew

...-3-89.
Over

Although there was nothing
apparent to induce Mr Jopp
at the to inspect this tank
& check the work done, still
the importance of the work, &
amount of the estimate, and
the fact of its being supervise
by a petty subordinate one
should have attracted his
attention to the necessity of
an early inspection of the
work.

In making the payme-
to the piece workers he cert
took the usual precaution
deducting 10% from the amo
of their bills, so that the
payment is not so flagran
as that perpetrated by his
predecessor — His apparent neglect
therefore in not making an
earlier inspection for the pu
pose of check measuring the
work on the Tank may b
put down to the reticence
the part of Mr Target
the in not informing him
that he had himself neglected his
~~the obvious duty~~ of to do
and that payments had b
made on the bills submi
by so petty a subordinate as
Tank Superintendent

..3-89.
Over

3074.

CO2/6

Mr W. Jopp, Esq:
Engr Railroad Divn
appeals against
the censure passed
~~apparent~~ upon him in
G.O. No. 173. W. of 22.1.89
and submits his
explanation of the
circumstances of the
case. W has called for
the file. For orders.

FB
2.4.89.

Note herewith.
Rees
2.4.89

~~75~~ ~~73~~ 70

---

ost on relief of Mr Target

S.A.A. P.A.C. 3074

This matter will be further considered at Ootacamund. The file can be sent up as it is.

2.4.89

Extract from Transfer Report on relief of Mr Targett dated 16th February 188

CO26

Ex. Engr's remarks

he Divisional Establishment does not allow for any Sub Dl. fficer. The works are very scat- red and there is an entire ab- ence of road. It is therefore mpossible for the E.E. to make uch check measurements of orks ~~completed~~ executed as can satisfy m that payments made to ntractors ~~all~~ are upon fair or st claims. Hence disputes ith contractors delays in yment. Execution of work and nsequent loss to the Estate."

× ×

(Signed). W. Jopp
Ex. Engr
16-2-88.

Supdg Engr's remarks

"It is certain that progress has been bad, the allotments are sufficient to justify ~~the~~ its employment of a competent Subordinate as S.D.O."

× ×

CO 26

(Signed). J. W. Rundall
Supdg Engr.
22/2/88.

(True Extract)

13/3.

72

W. Jopp
Ex. Engr
14-3-88

RN
1/911/89

N30

Enclo: to Ramnad E. E's No
of 14/3/89.

C. 2086.
1026

D.W.

S. E. refers to his Nos: 361. N.R. of 18.X.88 & 454. N.R. of 23.XI.88 & Says he is awaiting the orders of the C.E. for I. on them. The case was disposed of by G.O. No. 173. W. 8 22.1.89 and the recomdn. of the S.E. in regard to the over payments made was sanctioned.

It appears that the man has been told that if he can prove he did any work under orders which has not yet been paid for he will now receive the money for it.

If he brings a suit the onus of proof will lie with him. Perhaps the Pleader may be referred to Mr Hughes' Endorsement of Octr. 1888 with the remark that the Govt. are advised that the contractor has been paid in full for

EB

1026

work done by him

The S.E. might be told that in the event of a suit being filed against Govt he should at once apply for permission to defend it.

F.B.
7/3/89

Yes.
WOB
7.3.89

7/3/89

DW
W

6086

Statement shewing in detail excess payments made on earthwork on the Ramnad Tank improvements

Called for in G.O. No. $\frac{173\text{-}W}{22\text{-}1\text{-}89}$

During incumbency of Mr. Targett —

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Date of each payment	Quantities shown in measurement sheets of C. S. Hari Row supporting the vouchers.	Actual payments made on measurement of C. S. Hari Row.	Percentage of stoppage	Quantity of work actually turned out as arrived at by check measurement of Mr. Jopp.	Value of work actually turned out as arrived at by check measurement.	Payments made in excess of value of work actually turned out Columns 3-6.	Remarks.
In December 1887	61,231	[illegible]-4-0	Nil	70,217	at Rs 2-15-6 per 1000 cft. Rs 208-7-4.	Rs 372-9-4	The rates in Column 6 (Rs 2-15-6) at which work actually turned out is valued is arrived at by taking the mean value of the different rates at which payments were made on the measurement of C. S. Hari Row. This excess payment of Rs 372-9-4 is and always was quite irrecoverable payment having been made fully to a number of petty piece-workers.
In January 1888	1,34,575	[illegible]-12-8					
Totals during Mr. Targett's time	1,95,806	581-0-8	Nil	70217	Rs 208-7-4	Rs 372-9-4	
During incumbency of Mr. W. Jopp.							
February 1888	102492	275-0-0	32-8-6	1,37,209	at Rs 3 per 1000 cft. Rs 411-10-0	Rs 202-6-0	The rate in Column 6 (Rs 3-0-0) at which work actually turned out is valued is the same as that at which it was valued & paid for on the original bills. The excess payments made can be partially recovered — First there is a month's pay due to the late Tank Supdt. Hari Row — and second the same pieceworkers to whom the excess payments were made, were still working at the Tank when the excess payments were discovered, and payment for further work done was withheld. Thus as a set-off against the excess payments made during Mr. Jopp's incumbency, the following sums are recoverable. From — Kalimuthu Pillai — Rs 52 Selia Cotham — Rs 66 C. S. Hari Row — Rs 30 } Total Rs 148 The net excess payment will [illegible] If however these recoveries are not ap[illegible] supposing that the arrears due to the [illegible] the percentage [illegible] as made [illegible] paid off [illegible]
March 1888	115433	314-0-0	32-4-9				
April 1888	9662	25-0-0	3-15-9				
Total during Mr. Jopp's incumbency	2,27,587	614-0-0	68-13-0	1,37,209	Rs 411-10-0	Rs 202-6-0	

7 4a

5 7 A

5 6a

Abstract.

Net excess payments during Mr. Targett's time Rs 373

" — " — " — Mr. Jopp's — " Rs 54 —

427

Net to be charged to work — Rs 427

If the recovery of the Rs 148 as detailed in the Remarks column and as recommended by the S.E. in his letter No. $\frac{45}{23\text{-}1}$ $\frac{4RN}{1\text{-}88}$ printed with the G.O. is not approved then the sum to be charged off to the work will stand.

[illegible] 1/89

Excess payments during Mr. Targett's time Rs 373

" — " — Mr. Jopp's — " — Rs 202 —

Arrears being percentage deductions on work done [illegible] ... Rs 69 (say)

644

The notes contain the ~~[illegible]~~ verbal information given personally by the late Executive Engineer, the day before I relieved him.— They were taken down the same time as they were received and in the presence of S. S. Hari Row.—

14-3-89

Extract from Ex. Engr's Note Book

15-2-88 - Going through the Estimate of work in progress at Hd quarters under Hari Row -

1. Repairing Mantapam of Gurusami Covil attached to Saminathasami temple Ramnad - Materials only collected - not paid fully - 1026

1026

Foundations required under pillows not allowed for in Estimate -

Improving well cannot be carried out before May or June next - only lump sum allowed, as it is not possible to say what details of work will be till well is dry.

Ordered Hari Row to prepare revised Estimate excluding repairs to well which can be carried out in a separate Estimate in a year when it can be repaired -

2 - Building a shed north of Shunmugavilasam in the palace at Ramnad - Estd Rs 200

75 Estimate prepared at request of Manager not begun yet - materials being collec
no payments yet made on accoun

3 - Lagadam in the Pa
Ramn d - Repr - The late

had doubt as to the accuracy of the Estimate - It allows for removing existing floor 6" & replacing concrete with two coats plaster. This, he considered, is probably unnecessary & ordered the floor to be properly cleaned for further inspection -

Some Expenditure has been incurred on this although there is no sanctioned Estimate - Ordered Hari Row to prepare small estimate for my sanction to cover this - Brought also to accountant's notice

4 - Repg the Periathotikattu building in the palace at Ramnad - Est. Rs. 1485 -

Work in progress since last June & delayed by cancelling contract & so on - About half worked out

5 - Repg the sluices in the Ramnad Large tank.

Repairs to weir and to eleven vent sluice and petty repairs - Work

in progress as the suitable season

k was allowed to pass by

dra Sastry - He was subsequently transferred to Ramnathi - No more work can be done this year - (1024

6. Impt to Devastanam Supdts Office at Ramnad - Est. Rs. 6215 - (1026

Superstructure finished up to level of work - The work was given out on contract to Dyalu Naidu but was taken out of his hands for delay & proceeded with departmentally except the wood work which was given out to S. P. G. Industrial School - Late Contractor's account is not closed entirely although he has been paid & signed his final bill - his deposit has not yet been returned - The accountant has been written to on this subject -

This was an error at the time and should have been "Improvement" - the est. amount of Rs 15300 is correct and shows clearly which estimate was referred to.
14-3-89

7 - Ramnad Large Tank - Repairs ✱
Est. Rs. 15300.

Work in progress

8 - Elephant Shed - Est. Rs. 160
Not yet in hand -

× ×

(True Extract)

W. Sopp
14-3-89.
Ex. Engineer

13/3.

No. 1206 C d/9 March 1889

P.W. Dept.

Mr. T. Rajagopala Chariar is referred, in reply to his letter dated 25th December 1888, to the endorsement made on a petition from Seliya Kotten by the Supg: Engr: VI Circle and dated 16th October 1888, copy of which is forwarded for his information.

18th

C 26

He is informed that as at present advised the Ch: Engr: is ~~[illegible]~~ of opinion that Seliya Kotten has been paid in full for the work done by him.

WOB
7.3.89

7/3/89

To
M.R.Ry. Rajagopala Chariar
1st grade Pleader
Ramnad.
(with one enclo)

1026

77

No. 1207 C d/9th March 1889

Copy of the above forwarded to the Supg: Engr: VI Circle with reference to his

letter

" 4193C - 20-11-88
" 4055C - 23-10-88
" 3941C - 17-10-88
" 1523W - 18-6-84
" 1067W - 28-4-84
" 173W - 22-1-89

Letter No: 537. R.M. dated 15th January 1889 with the remark that his predecessor's letters quoted in para 1 were disposed of by memo: No: 4055. C. dated 23rd October 1888 and G.O. 173. W. dated 22nd January 1889 respectively.

In the event of Seliga Kotten filing a suit against Govt the Sup: Engr: should at once apply for sanction to defend it.

Memo
7.3.89

Memo

Nos 1206-7C of 9th March 188

To The Supg Engr. VI Circle.

Dw
W

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

1026

the file with the papers

5.IV.89

~~7th~~ ~~7th~~
7th

1732 - 30-11-88
4055 C - 23-10-88
3941 C - 17-10-88
15 - 1 - 96

CAW

These papers were handed over to me by Mr Calder of the Railway office - They have apparently slipped from some file sent up to W. - Please say whether you have

C 26

READ the following :—

rom W. Jopp Esq No. 148. R. N. of 14th March 1889.

by the Supdg Engineer VI Circle No. 687 of 30th March 1889

FOR ORDERS.

Mr. W. Jopp, Executive Engineer Ramnad Division, submits a letter dated 14th ultimo, through the Supdg Engineer VI Circle, appealing against the censure passed upon him (conjointly with his predecessor Mr. Target) in G.O. No. 173 W of 22nd January 1889. 75

His argument is founded on the fact that when he relieved Mr. Target, that officer did not inform him that work on the Ramnad Tank already paid for had not been checked - The remark taken down in Mr. Jopp's note book on information given him by Mr. Target was "work in progress."

ent
to the view taken in this
I observed before that the
to having seemed to Mr Target
Jopp.
Before the Chief Engineer will
take the necessary steps to give
Jopp a supervision of Seventh

79

9 96 / 11/13

This work is situated from 3 to 7 miles distance from Ramnad, and looking to the amount of the Estimate for the repairs of this tank and its masonry works, Viz Rs 21550, Mr Jopp's tour of inspection should necessarily have commenced with this Tank. The work was under a petty subordinate ranking as a 2nd grade Sub overseer in respect of the salary he drew.

Although there was nothing apparent to induce Mr. Jopp to inspect this tank and check the work done, still the importance of the work, the amount of the estimate, and the fact of its being supervised by a petty subordinate should have attracted his attention to the necessity of an early inspection of the work.

In making the payments to the piece workers he certainly took the usual precaution of deducting 10% from the amount of their bills, so that the overpayment is not so flagrant

as that perpetrated by his predecess This apparent neglect therefore in not making an Earlier inspection for the purpose of check measuring the work on the Tank may be put down to the reticence on the part of Mr Target in not informing him that he had himself neglected to do so and that payments had been made on bills submitted by so petty a subordinate as a Tank Superintendent—

I think the censure passed on Mr. Jopp may be rescinded under the circumstances brought to notice in his letter of appeal, in the hope that what has occurr may prove to him a salutary lesson, and show the necessity of keeping a careful check over work carried out by Subordinates who either from want of Experience, or inferior gradin in the Department require to be more closely supervised.

The necessity of having a Sub. Divisio Officer to assist the Executive Enginee in check measuring the work in the Ramnad Division is, I think, clearly shown in Mr. Jopp's letter,

~~The Hon Mr H. E. Stokes~~

and was recognized by the late Supdg Engineer Mr. J W Rundall.

Rhe D.S.
5-4-89

Ex. 1096

Cir 5/4. O.S. 5/4. R 6/4.

No. 1026 W

Genl Estabt

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the 13th April 1889

1096

READ the following

Letter from W. Jopp Esqre (H.E. No. 748 R.N. d/ March 14. 1889)
Endorsement by the S.E. VI Circle (" " 687 d/ " 30. ")
Note by the Acting Chief Engineer P.W.D. d/ April 5. ")

W.E.1. 8 apr.

His Excellency the Governor in Council has had under consideration the letter from Mr. W. Jopp, Executive Engineer in charge Ramnad Division, appealing against the censure passed upon him conjointly with Mr. Target in G.O. No. 173 W dated 22d January 1889, and praying for a reconsideration of his case.

2. In the circumstances now brought to notice in Mr. Jopp's letter, His Excellency in Council is pleased to withdraw the censure conveyed

in the G.O. in so far as it relates to Mr Jopp, but he ~~considers that~~ states, as ~~is referred to in the Note~~ by the Acting Chief Engineer, the extent of the work that was being carried out on the Ramnad Tank should have attracted the Executive Engineer's attention and induced him to have made an early inspection ~~of the work~~, when in all probability the errors committed ~~by his predecessor~~, would have been at once detected.

3. : ~~As the necessity~~ Early steps will be taken for for posting a Subdivisional Officer to the Ramnad Division has now been clearly shewn, the Acting Chief Engineer will take early steps for having this done.

WCM 12.4.89 RMcD 6.4.89

E AJ 13.4

S. E VI Circle.
C. E P.W.D

D 25/

CO28

82

Govt. of (1889) Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

19/4/89

Dated

Recd. Encl.

G.O. 13 Apl 1889 No. 1026 W

Mr. Jopp, Ex Engr

=

Orders withdrawing the censure passed on him in G.O. No 173 W of 22 Jan 89 in connection with the work at the Ramnad Tank.

80
81 ~~70~~

40/2

P 13/4. Ed 13/4