

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 24
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 1-12-88
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 6/2

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

(58)

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P. W. D. துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	75	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	11-1-1889	198

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

கேள்

12. Shueh

ஆவண. கா-1-18,000-15-6-87.

Letter from the Executive Engineer,
Mellore Division to the Dyptg Engineer & Co.
No 276 dated 4th September 1888. 15
Sir, 75 1

I have the honor to report the
following for your orders.

In June 1887 two bills (60 Nos 265,
266) aggregating Rs. 25-6-11 were paid
to one Volipu Guravada of Kovur by
mistake instead of Volipu Guravada
of Chenurpad by the Sargam Sah-
-Division Officer Mr. Whiteley through
the Cashier A. Gopaliah in his office.

Mr. Whiteley was relieved by Mr.
Subrahmanya Iyer when I went on
leave in July, Mr. Whiteley taking charge
of the Division.

The fact that a wrong payment had
been made was soon discovered.

On the 13th August P. Seturou relieved
A. Gopaliah who handed over 2 bills for
Rs. 25-3-4 + 1-8-4 respectively due to V.
Guravada of Kovur and a note stating
that Rs. 25-6-11 had to be recovered from
this man. V. Guravada of Kovur objected
to the recovery of Rs. 25-6-11 being made
and the two bills above referred to were
not paid but held over till the matter
could

could be settled. on the 14th Sept^r 1887
Mr. Subrahmanya Iyer referred the matter
to Mr. Whiteley for decision and in reply
received the following endorsement.

"Vollipu Guravadu, a tall, young fair
wudder of Kovur was by mistake paid
a Bill for Rs. 25-6-11 which bill was
due to another Vollipu Guravadu who
worked on the Eastern Channel 2nd
section and whom Mr. Whitbread can
point out. This amount was afterwards
recovered from V. Guravadu of Kovur
and paid to the other man. No action
is necessary."

Mr. Whiteley cannot remember
the particulars which led to his issuing
this endorsement but says that it was
written on the strength of information
given to him by some one in the Division
office. On the 27th September 1887 Mr.
Subrahmanya Iyer returned the endorse-
ment to the Executive Engineer and
as the orders in the endorsement were
clear and explicit he paid ^{V.} Guravadu
of Kovur the sums due on the two bills
aggregating Rs 26-11- on the 12th October.

The question again came up this
year

year as V. Guravadu of Chenuvpad
sent me a petition which on being
enquired into, elicited the above facts.
I find that Mr. Whiteley had on 12-12-85
issued a circular to subordinates to
give a chit to taskworkers going to
the Sub-Division office for payment
for the purpose of identification. Had
this been acted on, the wrong payment
could not have been made.

Had Mr. Subrahmanya Iyer written
either officially or demi officially to
the Executive Engineer, the incorrectness
of the endorsement quoted above
would have been ascertained at once.
The endorsement was so explicit that
Mr. Subrahmanya Iyer did not think
it advisable to make a further reference.

If a strict view of the case is taken
I consider the sum of Rs. 25-6-11 wrongly
paid should be recovered from Mr. Whiteley
but it appears to me that the non-recovery
was chiefly due to the change of Officers
and clerks which occurred at the time
and I would request your permission
to charge to works the sum of Rs 25-6-11
which must now be paid to V. Guravadu
of

of Chenurpad.

I have &c
(Signed) A. A. G. Malet
Executive Engineer.

Reply to the Executive Engineer,
Nellore Division No 532 N.D. of 14-9-88.

Sir,

Your letter No 276 of 4th instant.

Be so good to submit your Accountant's explanation for allowing Mr. Whiteley to forward the Memo quoted by you when he must have known perfectly well that no recovery was made. Had it been made in the sub-division office, it would have been known to the sub-division writer and consequently to Mr. Subrahmanya Iyer who would not in that case have applied for orders on the matter.

Admitting which is very improbable, that Mr. Whiteley made a mistake & was not informed by the Accountant or any one else in the office that the amount was recovered, it was surely the duty of his Accountant to point out the mistake.

I have &c
(Signed) J. Hannan,
Supty. Engineer
H. circle. Explanation

Explanation of the Accountant, Nellore
Division, dated 4th October 1888 to the
Executive Engineer, Nellore D^o

Respected Sir,

75/3
With reference to Supty. Engr's
No 532 N of 14th Sept 1888, I humbly
beg to state that the payment to a
wrong man was made on the 23rd June 1887
in the sub-division office, when Mr. Whiteley
was in charge. When Mr. Subrahmanya
Iyer's No 924 of 14th Sept 1887 was received
and endorsed by the then Executive Engineer
I was under the impression, that the
complaint made by V. Guravadu of
Chenurpad was false, as the endorsement
gave a description of the man and
warranted no further action.

2. The recovery from the wrong party
and payment to the legitimate man
being of a private nature, I believed
the contents of the endorsement in
good faith.

3. On receipt of this endorsement
the Ag. Sub-divisional Officer did not
take further steps, which also confirmed
the truth of the statement.

4. As the transaction did not take
place in this office, and I did not
see the parties, I believed that V.
Guravadu of Chenurpad was making
false

false statements to the Sub-Divisional Officers, taking advantage of the fact that there were changes in the Sub-Div. Officers and Clerks.

5. In conclusion, I beg to state that I do not recollect having said anything on the subject to Mr. Whiteley as I did not know much of the transaction.

I beg &c
(Signed) A. Leshachellam
Accountant.

N^o 332
13-10-88.

Forwarded to the Suptg. Engr.
with reference to his N^o 532 N.
14-9-88.

The Accountant's explanation is — that he gave Mr. Whiteley no information on the subject & was not asked for any; that he considered from the specific wording of the Endorsement that Mr. Whiteley was writing from his own personal knowledge & that most likely the transaction had been a private one the money having been recovered from one man & paid to the other either in Mr. Whiteley's presence, or subject to his knowledge. The fact that Mr. Subrahmanya Iyer made no further reference confirmed him in this

this belief. If this had been done no action as far as the accounts were concerned was necessary, as a receipt for the money had already been obtained under the name of V. Guravadu.

The Accountant's explanation appears to me to be satisfactory, and I regret that owing to lapse of time Mr. Whiteley cannot remember the particulars which led him to write the endorsement. Mr. Whiteley must have been quite satisfied at the time that the money had been recovered, and under these circumstances I would request your permission to write off Rs. 25-6-11 to works.

(Signed) A. A. G. Malet
Executive Engineer
Nellore Division.

Letter from the Suptg. Engineer II Circle to the Examiner, P.W. Accounts N^o 645 N. dated 30-10-88.

Sir,

Ex. Engr's N^o 276
4-9-88
S. Engr's Reply N^o 532 N.
14-9-88.
Ex. Engr's Endorsement
N^o 332 on the
13-10-88
Accountant's
explanation.

I have the honor to forward for your instructions copies of correspondence marginally noted, as the Code does not, as far as I can make out, give me power to comply with the Division Officer's request

request to charge off the wrong
payment to the work. From the
Division Officer's silence on the subject
he is evidently of opinion that there
is no chance of recovering the money
from the Buntadar in which implied
opinion I concur.

I have &c
(Signed) J. Hannan,
Suptg. Engineer.

N^o. 646 M
30-10-88

Copy of letter N^o. 645 M
30-10-88 forwarded
to the Executive Engineer, Nellore Division,
for information.

(Signed) J. Hannan,
Suptg. Engineer.

Letter from the Examiner, P.W. Accounts
to the Suptg. Engineer. 2nd circle,
N^o. 657 S.E. dated 14th Novr. 1888.

Sir,

With reference to your letter N^o.
645 M. dated 30th October 1888, I have
the honor to state that if there had
certainly been no negligence on the part
of any officer of the Department, the
matter could have been dealt with
by

75
by you and myself under Code para
1973; but on the facts as stated by
the Executive Engineer, I agree with the
latter in thinking that Mr. Whiteley
cannot be held entirely free from
responsibility for the mistake and
that therefore the orders of Government
seem necessary.

I have &c
(Signed) C. A. P. Christie,
Major R.E.
Examiner, P.W. Accounts.

(True copies)

AMLD
Executive Engineer in charge,
II circle.

N^o 743 N.L. Suptg. Engineer's Office,
2nd Circle.
15th December 88
From,

A. B. Todd Esquire, ⁷⁵/₆
Executive Engineer in Charge,
2nd Circle.

To,

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to your Memo N^o 4832 C of the 12th Instant, I have the honor to send herewith copies of the correspondence noted below regarding the wrong payment made to V. Guravadu, contractor in the Tangam Sub-Division of the Kellore Division, for your information and orders.

Letter from the Executive Engineer, Kellore D^o
N^o 276 of 4-9-88.

- " to — D^o — 532 N^o of 14-9-88
- " from — D^o — 332 of 13-10-88.
- " to Examiner P.W.A. 645 M. of 30-10-88.
- " to Executive Engineer, Kellore - 646 M. of —
- " from Examiner P.W.A. - 657 1st of 14-11-88

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most Obedt^l Servant,

[Signature]
Executive Engineer in Charge,
II Circle.

[Signature]

75
7

75

7

From The Supt. Engineer,
II Circle.

To The Chief Engineer
P.W. Dept

Dated 15th December 1888



743 NL

Encl 1

Guravadu. - The wrong
payment made to -
Copies of correspondence
on the subject of -

No. 707. NL Superintending Engineer
Office, II Circle, Beg. No. 24th November 1888

From

J. Hannan Esq., 75 75,
Superintending Engineer, 8
II Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer,
Public Works Department,
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to bring
to your notice that the Executive
Engineer Mallore Division requests
permission to charge to works the sum
of Rs 25.6.11 which was wrongly paid
to one Vallepu Guravadu of Kovir,
and which must now be paid to
another of the same name living
in Chemurpad.

2. The wrong payment was made
under the order of Mr. Whiteley, and
the Executive Engineer states that if a
strict view of the case is taken, he
considers that the sum wrongly
paid sh. d. be recovered from
Mr. Whiteley. The Examiner to whom

It must then be paid to the
information of the P.W. Dept.

the matter was referred, also Concurs
with the Executive Engineer, And requests
me to obtain the sanction of Govern-
ment to write off to works if I differ
from the above opinion.

3. I gather from the explanations
obtained from the Executive Engineer
and the Accountant that the
non-recovery of the wrong payment
was due to change of officers & clerks
in the Sangam Sub Division which
occurred at the time, and that the
responsibility of wrong payment
cannot be solely attributed to Mr
Whiteley. I request, therefore,
you will be good enough to authorize
the above sum being charged to the
works concerned.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedt servant

J. H. Annan
Superintending Engineer
H. Circle

The Suptg. Engineer,
2nd Circle.

To, The Chief Engineer,
P. W. D.

Dated 24th Nov^r 1888.

№ 707 НК.

No. 4832 c of 1st Dec 1885

Wrong payment in the
of Rs. 25-6-11.
Vellore Dⁿ_n - Request
to authorise a — being
charged to the works
concerned, for certain
reasons.

S. E. II Circle.
S. E. II circle

Wm Duff
3/12

UNDER date the

READ the following

From the S. G. II Circle 42707 u. d. 27 24. Nov. 1888
" " 80 " 7443 u. d. 25 Dec. "

I think Whitely ought to have this sum
 & I see no ground for anything else
 less as a charge against Gov.^r

wholly under the payment to the
Honor man contrary to the provisions
of his own circular regarding identi-
fication club. He also gave an
entirely unfounded endorsement
stating that the wrong payment
had been recovered, in consequence
the second payment was made.

It is necessary to enforce discipline
on subordinates in such matters
and in this case Whitney was clearly
grossly negligent. I don't know
what his pay is. If the sum is more
than 10% of his pay is money he
received in instalments of that
amount.

It seems to be assumed without saying that the Kover man cannot repay. Whately may be told to recover the money if he can, either by suit or by stoppage of any others money due.

ms 5/au

Sup^d to the circumstances
stated, the overpayment
of Rs 25-6-11 may be
written off as a charge
against the works.

2. The Govt. notice with dissatisfaction that this case has been allowed to go on without settlement - for more than a year, and they agree with the Examiner that Mrs Whitley cannot be held entirely free from blame, as
his

10

his mistake caused the
double payment.

Mh
22/11/00

To wait for H. H.

Cu
Hw. 4. 1. 89
L. 7. 1. 89

S. S. II Circle

Santhosha

Cu 13 0411.

Hw. 4. 1. 89

For orders.

The facts of the case
appear to be that a
sum of Rs 25-6-11 was
paid to V. Guruvadu of
Kosur, by mistake,
instead of to V. Guruvadu
of Chennupad.

At the same time
there was another bill
of Rs 26-11-00 due to
V. Guruvadu of Kosur,
& it would have been
easy to deduct from
this the sum already
paid to him, & transfer
it over to Guruvadu
of Chennupad.

When however the
matter was referred
to Mr. Whitey for orders,
he made an entry on
the re-divisional file
letter to the effect that
the sum wrongly paid
had been "recovered"
from V. Guruvadu of Kosur
and

sum recovered, and the

his mistake caused the

and paid to the other man - no
action is necessary -

on the strength of the
order, the sub divisional
officer paid the second sum
of Rs 26-11-00 to Guruswami of
Korur.

Mrs Whiteley cannot
remember how he wrote
his order, or who gave
him the information -

It is now sought
to write off the excess
payment as a charge
to the work.

Cc
21.12.88

After the sum was paid
written off but the
check of 6 rs 5 paise
was sent to this sum then
he allowed to go in without
settlement he even then in
your case that the Whiteley
cannot be that far away
with the sum the Whiteley
cannot be held entirely free
the blame is his mistake
caused the double payment.

W.H.
21/12/100

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the

Read the following

From the S. S. II Circle Rs 707 u.d. of 24th Nov: 1888
" " " " " 743 u.d. of 15th Dec: " "

The Govt. see no
ground for accepting the
loss of Rs 25-6-11 as a
charge against the State,
& direct that the amount
be recovered from Mrs
Whiteley.

2. Mrs Whiteley made
the payment to V. Guruswami
of Korur contrary to the
provisions of his own cir-
cular requiring identi-
fication Chits. He also gave
an entirely unauthorised
endorsement stating that
the wrong payment had
been recovered, and was

12

Consequence the second payment
was made. It is necessary
to enforce due care on Officers
& subordinates in such matters,
and in this case Mr. Whiteley
was clearly negligent.

3. It will be left to
Mr. Whiteley to reimburse
himself by recovering the
amount from V. Guzman
of Honor either by suit,
or by stoppage of any other
money due.

W. H.
10/1/09

Recovery of a sum of
Rs 25-6-11 from
Mr. Whiteley

75 W. H. Jany 1889

(12)

W. H.
10/1/09
Cu

End

✓
L. E. II made
Gen. P. W. H. 11/1