(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 46

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 26.6.89

(3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம்

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P.W.D துறை

அரசாணை எண். / மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண். 454 W
அச்சகம் / பலவகை

நாள் : 11. 2. 1890 198 .

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

ஆவண, கா-1—18,006—15-6-87.

(C. No. 146.)

454/1

From

MAJOR C. H. P. CHRISTIE, R.E.,
EXAMINER OF P. W ACCOUNTS, MADRAS,

To

THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
Presidency DIVISION.

No. 948 LE/5 *Madras,* 8th August 1888.

SIR,

I have the honor to give overleaf a list of claims against and dues to Government, which, according to the accounts for the month of May 1888, have remained unsettled for three months, and to request that you will be good enough to complete the statement by entering in the list explanations of the delays brought to notice.

2. As the explanations given may have to be reported for the information of the Government, I must ask that they may be full and clear.

3. In cases in which the dues may be considered irrecoverable or the arrears not likely to be claimed, the fact should be stated, as also the steps you have taken or propose to take for writing them off.

4. As regards arrears due to contractors, I would invite your attention to Madras P.W.D. code para. 1828, edition of 1886, under which if a contractor delays to receive final payment for more than one month after the final certificate has been passed, the Superintending Engineer's permission should be obtained to close the accounts of the work, and to credit to deposits any balance due to the contractor.

5. A spare copy of the form is attached, in case you should wish to take a copy of this letter and statement for record in your office.

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

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

500—14-7-88.

M. Jr. Enc. me.

List of claims against and dues to Government which, according to accounts for the month of May 1888, have remained unsettled for three months.

Item No.	Schedule, or Account concerned.	Name of Creditor (for claims against Government) or Debtor (for dues to Government).	Amount due	
			To Government.	From Government.
1	Return of Buildings rented or available for Rent	Surgeon Major G. B. Hickson	45 " -	
2		Surgeon H. A. Jacob	61 5 4	
3	Schedule of Stock Purchases & Sales	T. Annooga Chetty	253 12 "	
4	Extract from Contracter's Ledger	V. Streenevasa Chariar	" " "	30 " "
5		B. Moonusawy Sa:	" " .	20 " "
6		N. Streenevasa Iyengar		36 - "
7		Do		741 " "
8		V. Samarpuri Moodly:		339 " "
9		D°		348 " "
10		C. Appasamy Moodly		12 " "
11		D°		43 " "

No 147 C of 20-8-88

Item No.	Executive Engineer's explanation of delay in settlement of dues and claims.	Examiner's remarks.
1	Adjusted in August/88.	✓
2	This officer is in Burmah. List was sent to the Field Paymaster Burmah thro: the Pay Examiner Madras. Since reminded—	×
3	Steps have been taken to make a recovery but if not successful a civil suit will be instituted—	×
4	Final Bill not received	✓
5	Paid in July/88.	✓
6	Final Bill not received	
7	Funds were applied for, but not given, sanction was also asked to pay the contractor & close his acct, but this also has not been granted—	×
8 9 10 11	Final Bills not received	×

J. M. Thompson
Col R.E.

Ex: Engineer

Dull
Acctt
20.8.88

20 AUG 88

10 AUG 89
PRESIDENCY DIVISION

EXAMINER
No.
21 AUG 1889
ENCLOSURES
P.W. ACCOUNTS

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 1913
2 SEP. 89
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No.
20 JAN. 90
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Copy of letter from the Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Madras, to the Superintending Engineer 5th Circle, No. 1009 A.E./5 ~~908 S. E. 5.~~ dated 11th September ~~dated 21st August~~ 1888.

I have the honor to append a list of claims against and dues to Government which according to the accounts of the Presidency Division for May 1888 have now remained unsettled for more than 4 months, together with the Executive Engineer's explanations of the delays in settlement, and to suggest that the Executive Engineer may be asked to take the necessary steps for the adjustment of the items at an early date.

Dues to Government	Executive Engineer's explanation of delay in settlement.
(1) T. Aroomooga Chetty for stock sold to him Rs 253-12-0	Steps have been taken to make a recovery but if not successful a civil suit will be instituted

Claims against Government	
(2) Contractor V. Streenivasa Charriar Rs 30/-	Final bills not received
(3) —do— N. Streenivasa Iyengar Rs 36/-	
(4) —do— Y. Samarapuri Mood. Rs 239/-	
(5) —do— —do— —do— Rs 348/-	
(6) —do— C. Appasawmy Mood. Rs 12/-	
(7) —do— —do— —do— Rs 43/-	

Charges against Government	Executive Engineers explanation of delay in settlement
(8) Contractor N. Streenivasa Iyengar Rs 741/-	Funds were applied for but not given, sanction was also asked to pay the Contractor and close his accounts, but this also has not been granted

7/5004
13-8-89

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO. 4187
2 SEP. 89
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO.
20 JAN. 90
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

True Copy

G. C. Patten
Supdt. Correspondence Branch

P. 3/7
P. 18

10-9
E. 7

PW 7201
7948
761

No. 783 M.C.

Madras D. P. W.
Bangalore 12th November/88

454/4

From
The Executive Engineer
Presidency Division

To
The Superintending Engineer
3rd Circle

Sir

With reference to your No. 3210 dated 25th October/1888, I have the honor to inform you that the items shown in Examiner's letter No. 1009 S. E. V dated 11th Septr 1888 have been adjusted as follows:—

Dues to Government

(1) T. Armooga Chetty – Stock sold to him Rs 253-12-0.	Sub Divisional Officer's report has been received & case will be prepared for a Civil Suit to be instituted to recover the amount

(2) Claims against Government.

(2) Contractor V. Streenivasa Chariar. Rs 30. ✓ (3) Contr. N. Streenivasa Iyengar – Rs 36. ✓	Paid on 17th October 1888.
(4) Contr. Y. Samarapoory Moor. Rs 339- (5) Do. Do. Rs 348	Erroneously shown as balance due – Final Bills were received & paid for in March 1888 – Supplemental ledger for March 1888 sent to the Examiner on 10th October/88

Claims against Govt.

(6) Contr. C. Appasawmy Mudr. - Rs. 12-0-0 }
(7) " Do. " 43-0-0 } Paid on 17th October 1888.

(8) " N. Streenivasa Iyengar Rs. 74-0-0 } Awaiting funds.

EXAMINER No. 1697 R 27 V 1888 ENCLOSURES P.W. ACCOUNTS

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE No. 5187 2 SEP. 89 P.W.D. FOURTH CIRCLE

Shaw the Lovat
(Sd) Ross Thompson Col. R.E.
Executive Engineer Presidency Dn.

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE 20 JAN. 90 P.W.D. FOURTH CIRCLE

No. 3821.

To the Examiner P.W. Accounts with reference to his letter No. 1009 dated 11th September 1888.

W. H. Hinton
Col. R.E.
Superintg. Engineer
5th Circle

23rd November 1888.

454/5

Copy of letter from the Examiner of P.W. Accounts, Madras, to the Superintending Engineer 5th Circle, No. 21 S.C. 5, dated 16th January 1889.

With reference to your endorsement No. 3821 dated 23rd November 1888 communicating the explanation of the Executive Engineer Presidency Division regarding the amount of Rs 253-12-0 due to Government by P. Arumuga Chetty for stock sold to him, I have the honor to request you will inform me what progress has since been made towards the recovery of the sum due.

(True Copy)

G. E. Hatton
Supdt. Correspondence Branch

5/2201
13/9

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO.
2 SEP. 89
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO.
20 JAN. 90
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

E7/9

PW 2172
2448/89

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V CIRCLE, MADRAS, 459/6
Chepâk, 25th January 1889.

No. 4947

From
Colonel W H Burton R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
V CIRCLE,

To
THE Examiner
Public Works Accounts.

SIR,

Enclosures.

With reference to your letter No. 21/SE, dated 16th January 1889, I have the honor to state that instructions have been given to the Executive Engineer Presidency Division to make further endeavours to make the Contractor Armooga chetty pay the amount of Rs 253. 12.. due by him to Government.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your Most Obedt Servant
W H Burton Col R

Superintending Engineer 5th Cir

4/500 W

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,

V CIRCLE,

EXAMINER
24
26 JAN
P. W. ACCOUNTS

To

THE

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
2 SEP. 89
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
20 JAN. 90
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Dated }
Recd. } 188 .

541
No 3130
7968

ENCLOSURES.

No. 4947

Copy of letter from the Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Madras, to the Superintending Engineer 5th Circle, No. 160 S. E. 5 dated 12th March 1889.

With reference to your letter No. 4947 dated 23rd January 1889 intimating that instructions had been given to the Executive Engineer Presidency Division to further endeavour to make Contractor Apoomooga Chetty pay the amount Rs 253-12-0, owing by him since March 1887, I have the honor to request you will inform me what progress has since been made towards the recovery of the debt.

(True Copy)

G E Salter

Supdt. Correspondence Branch

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
2 SEP. 89
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
20 JAN. 90
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

E.5

M.717/
7948/

(C. No. 255)

From

Major C. H. P. Christie R.E 454/8
Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Madras.

To

The Superintending Engineer
5th Circle

No. 444 S.E/5 Madras 4th July 1889

No. 160 SE/5 of 12th March 1889.
Subject—

Amount of Rs 153-12-0 due by Apoomooga Chetty since March 1887— Enquires what progress has been made towards the recovery of——

Reminders sent as under—

1st	30th	March	1889.
2nd	10th	May	1889.
3rd	6th	June	1889.
			188 .

Sir,

I have the honor to invite your special attention to my letter noted in the margin to which no reply has been received although three reminders have been sent to you. I request that, if you cannot now dispose finally of the references in question you will be good enough to explain at once what prevents you from doing so, and to state when the final disposal may be expected.

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

sd/ C. H. P. Christie Major R.E
Examiner of P. W. Accounts, Madras

(True Copy)

G. E. Statton
Supdt. Correspondence Branch.

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE
2 SEP 89
P.W.D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

20 JAN 90
FOURTH CIRCLE

No. 7172/89
7948
[illegible]

45⁴/9

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V CIRCLE, MADRAS,
Chepák, 22 July 1889.

No 2721

From
Colonel W. H. Burton R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
V CIRCLE,

To
THE Examiner
Public Works accounts.

Enclosures

SIR,

I have the honor to inform you in reference to your letter No 160 of 12 March 89 that it is apparently impossible to recover Rs 253-12-0 from late Presidency Division Contractor Armuga Chetty - both the Ex: Engineer and accountant of the Division have now left in my opinion it was by their neglect of duty or carelessness that an overpayment was made to this man.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your Most Obedt Servant
WHBurton Col RE
Supg: Engineer V circle

P. W. ACCOUNTS
28 JUL
ENCLOSURES

From

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
V CIRCLE,

To

THE

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
2 SEP. 89
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
20 JAN. 90
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Dated }
Recd. } 18

ENCLOSURES.

No.

[C. No. 8.]

454/10

GOVT. OF MADRAS. } 1889. { P. W. DEPT.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS.

Madras, 1st August 1889.

OFFICE NOTE No. 1081.

To

W.

I beg to forward herewith for information and orders of Government the correspondence as per margin relative to a sum of Rs.253-12-0 due by contractor T.Armooga Chetty for shell lime supplied to him by the Executive Engineer Presidency Division and which is outstanding since March 1887.

2. From letter from the Supg.Engineer 5th.Circle No.2721 dated 22nd. July 1889 it will be seen that it is apparently impossible to recover the amount from the contractor, and that in the Supg.Engineer's opinion the loss is due to the neglect of duty & carelessness of the Executive Engineer and accountant both of whom now left the division.

C.

(Encl 8)

(1) No.147 C.dated 20th.August 1888 from the Executive Engineer Presidency Division in original to be returned.

(2) Copy of Examiner's letter No. 1009 S.E.5 of 11th.September 1888 to the Supg.Engineer 5th. Circle.

(3) No.3821 of 23rd.November 1888 from the Supg.Engineer in original (to be returned).

(4) Copy of Examiner's letter No. 218.E.5 of 18th.January 1889 to the Supg.Engineer.

(5) No.4947 of 23rd.January 1889 from the Supg.Engineer in original (to be returned)

KEEP-WITH Genl. No.

dated 188 .

(6) Copy of Examiner's letter No. 180 S.E.5 of 12th.March 1889 to the Supg.Engineer.

(7) Copy of Examiner's letter No. 444 S.E.5 of 4th.July 1889 to the Supg.Engineer.

(8) No.2721 of 22nd.July 1889 from Supg.Engineer in original (to be returned).

2,000—9-10-88.

P.W.C. No. 7770

7948/89

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
20 JAN. 90
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
2 SEP. 89
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Regn No. 5001
10-8-89

R/y 7-8-89

E.8

P. W. Dept.

To be returned with reply.

No. 3602 C d/ 10th Augt. 1889

Referred to the Suptg. Engineer V circle, for favour of early and full report as to why it is impossible to recover the money from Contractor Armooga Chetti.

Rudrale - Brickman
Lt.-Col. R.E.
Ag. Jt. Secy. to Govt. P.W.D.

Ack. 3418

5.8.89

No. 1216.

5th July 1889.

454/11

To
The Executive Engineer
Presidency Division

Sir,

In reference to Memo No. S.D. 1025 dated 2nd instant, respecting Armoogam Chetty's dues, I have the honor to report that I have had no opportunity of giving the man any work to make recoveries of the due.

The works below rupees 2500 are allotted to Annual Contractors.

Of other works only one has been Sanctioned* and tenders called for, but Armooga Chetty declined to tender, as the rates of principal items of work are very low.

* St. George's Cathedral Extending Cemetery.

When Sanction is obtained for other special works, Contractor Armoogam might have one in order to recover the money allotted to him in order to recover the money due by him.

I have &c
Sd/ S. Ottman
Asst. Engineer Civil Works.

No. 489 S.E.
16-7-89.

1. Copy forwarded to the Supg. Engineer V Circle, with reference to his No. 114 dated 16th May 1889.

2. The Contractor is, I understand, a pauper

pauper with command of neither money nor labor, and therefore a person unfit to be entrusted with Government work.

3. If the custom which prevails in every other Division that I have ever served in, of the Sub Divisional Officers entering on the face of any bill they submit the amount to be deducted on account of materials supplied, had prevailed in this Division this excess payment and others of a similar nature, would not have occurred. The Contractor, apparently, offered to pay in 4 instalments which offer was refused. The only alternative now is to lay a suit against him

S/ B. DeWinton
Executive Engineer Presy Dn

No. 771
22-5-88.

From The Superintending Engineer
5th Circle
To The Executive Engineer
Presidency Division

His letter No. 186 S.E. dated 15th May 1888

The Explanation given in the Executive Engineer's letter No. 1097 of 16th January 1888 is not sufficient. If burnt shell was issued to the Contractor to the value of Rs. 403-8-4 it must have been issued upon the Executive Engineer's sanction. There must therefore have been information of this in

in the Executive Engineer's Office, when payment was made to the Contractor on 31st March 1887, and payment to him should have been deferred until it had been ascertained whether he had paid up or not for the burnt shell supplied to him. The Executive Engineer should explain who is responsible for paying the Contractor without recovering what was due by him.

S/ H. M. Vibart Coll R.E.
Supdg Engineer 5th Circle

No. 819 S.E.

Madras D.P.W.
Bangalore 21st November 1888.

From
The Executive Engineer
Presidency Division
To
The Superintending Engineer
V Circle

Sir,

With reference to your Memo No. 1083 dated 12th June 1888 I have the honor to submit the following statement of the case against T. Armooga Chetty against whom it is intended to institute a Civil Suit for the recovery of Rs. 253-12 for value of burnt shell issued to him and would point out that had the suggestion made in my letter No. 999 S.E. dated 12th December 1887 been accepted, in all probability the amount would have been recovered by this time.

T. Armooga Chetty was nominated the Contractor for Provincial Civil Repair Works

of

up to Rs 2500 in the Civil Works Sub Division in February 1887 on the Cancelment of the Contract of C. Ragava Pillay. It has been and is the practice to issue to Contractors the burnt shell ut turned from the Government Lime Kilns nd to recover the value from the Bills for work done by them. On this principle, burnt shell to the value of Rs 403-12-0 was issued to Armooga Chetty in March 1887 - This Contractor's Bill was received and paid on the 31st March 1887. before the receipt of the Stock accounts for March 1887. was received from the Civil works Sub Division. These accounts were received about the 15th April/87 when it was found that Armooga Chetty was due to Government Rs 403-12-0 for burnt shell received. There were no bills to make this recovery from him, and the Sub-Divisional Officer was requested to take steps to recover the amount from the Contractor. The Sub-Divisional Officer frequently called upon the man to pay up, without success, but in November 1887 the Contractor wrote to the Sub Divisional Officer to say that he would pay Rs 150 down and the difference in four monthly instalments commencing from February 1888. he accordingly paid Rs 150 in December 1887 and the remainder Rs 253-12-0 is still unpaid. Had the Sub

Divisional

454/13

Divisional Officer noted in the Bills for March 1887 that so much had to be deduct from the Contractor when he submitted the Bills to this Office, the recovery would have been made, as this Office is not in a position to know what issues of burnt shell are made to a Contractor till the Sub-Divisio Accounts are received.

I have &c.

Sd/ Ross Thompson Col. R.E.

Executive Engineer Presy Dn.

(True Copy)

W H Brinton

Col R.E.

Supg Engineer 5th Circle

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO.
2 SEP. 89
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO.
20 JAN. 90
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

No 7946
16/1/90

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER'S OFFICE,
V Circle, Madras,

No. 3406.

464
14

~~Chepauk~~ Dusi, 18th August 1889.

From
Colonel W. H. Burton R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER, V CIRCLE,

To
THE Chief Engineer
P. W. Department

SIR,

Enclosures. 4 in 1 sheet.

With reference to your Memo No 2802 dated 10th August 1889 I have the honor to report that it seemed to me when, as on the 21st November 1888, I had the Contractor Armooga Chetty before me, consequent on an application from late Executive Engineer that he should prosecute ~~him~~ Contractor that it was impossible to recover "the Rs 253-12-0 owed by him to Executive "Engineer for lime because the Contractor was "evidently a pauper - and was not in a position "to take or execute work & that the result would "not benefit Government in any way. But I urged the late Executive Engineer to employ him on some works & to so endeavour to recover the debt, but the man either did not tender or refused to take some work which was consequently offered him - saying to the Asstt Engineer that "the rates were too low."

Mr. De Winton also recommended that a Civil Suit should be filed against the

Contractor

454/15

Contractor for recovery of the debt, but because I believe he was a pauper; it was impossible for me to make any recommendation as to filing a suit to recover the debt as Mr. De Winton who is in no way responsible for original debt, has represented he is a "pauper". I shall cannot possibly see the use of prosecuting any such man with a view to extract money from him. But of course if Government otherwise order steps can be taken to prosecute, but there is no written agreement on which to found an action. It was altogether a mistake of the late Executive Engineer when as in January or February 1888 he permitted the employment of this man in his Division without a security or bond in lieu of another Contractor who had, as I understand, deposited security & signed a bond but who failed to carry out the work entrusted to him satisfactorily and instead of being excessively careful as to his dealings with him both the late Executive Engineer & late Accountant were excessively lax for they paid him on 31st March 1887 full amount of his bill 15 days before they would ordinarily receive the list of debits on account of lime issued in March /87 Rs 403-12-0 in excess in this case but reduced afterwards by a refund of Rs 150. to Rs 253-12-0.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedt. Servt.
W. Burton. Col. R.E.
Actg. Engineer 5th Circle

3402 / 89.

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

No. 182 D. P.W. Department.
Ootacamund. 30th Augt 1889

Referred to Colonel Ross-Thompson R.E., through the Supdg. Engineer IV Circle, for such Explanation as he may have to offer as to (1) his failure to take adequate Security for the advance, and (2) the apparent haste as reported by the Superintending Engineer V Circle, in settling the Contractor's Accounts before receipt of the list of debits on account of lime issued

Lieut Col R.E.
Ag Chief Engr. B & R Branch

To
The Supdg Engineer
IV Circle
to be returned.

P.W.S. 145/8
8-28-8-89

From P W C No 7948

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
V CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
P. W. Deptt

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO. [illegible]
2 SEP. 89
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

SUPG: ENGINEER'S OFFICE
NO. [illegible]
20 JAN. 90
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

Dated 18 }
Recd. 26 } August 1889.

No 454 W of 11 Feby 1890

Enclosures 4 10
No. 3400.

Contractor Armooga Chetty — Explaining the circumstances under which the sum of Rs 253-12-0 due by — cannot be recovered by prosecuting him.

Referred.

No 3587

454/16

N.B.—*The number and date of this letter should be quoted in any future communications on this subject.*

P. W. D.
NILGIRI DIVISION OFFICE,
STATION, Ootacamund 17 Janry 1890.

From Col. Ross Thompson R.E.
EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
NILGIRI DIVISION,

ENCLOSURES. 10

To

THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
FOURTH CIRCLE,
COIMBATORE.

SIR,

With reference to your No. 445/N.I. of 3rd September 1889, I regret being unable to offer any further explanation than that already given in my No. 819 S.E of 21st November 1888. —

So far as I can remember the case. The Contractor for Provincial Civil Repairs, C. Ragava Pillay, failed to carry out his contract, and late in the working year, viz in February 1887, his contract had to be cancelled and another man appointed at once to complete the work of the year. viz. up to 31st March 1888. T. Armooga Chetty was appointed — and

and in the hurry and Worry of getting the Work of the year completed, the question of security was lost sight of. This no doubt was my fault and I regret it very much.

With regard to the payment of the Contractor's bill - If the Sub Divl. Officer had noted on it - as he should have done - the deduction to be made on account of lime issued to the Contractor, this deduction would of course have been made by me, but this was not brought to my notice by either the Head Accountant or by the Sub Divisional Officer, and I paid the bill in full. I may add that it is absolutely impossible for an Executive Engineer of a Division like the Presidency to remember the details of the numberless accounts of the numerous Contractors; in such matters he must rely to a large extent on the accuracy and honesty of his Sub Divl. Officers and Head Accountant. Otherwise work

work - real work must come to a stand still. In the matter of Accounts and Office Work generally the Presidency Division was always overworked, this fact has been recognized lately by the Commission upon D.P.W. accounts and procedure.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed't Servant

Geo Thompson
Colonel R.E.

18 JAN 90

Executive Engineer N.L.

ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 59 N.J.
20 JAN. 90
P. W. D.
FOURTH CIRCLE

From,

The Executive Engineer
Nilgiri Division

To

The Supg: Engineer,
IV Circle.

Dated 17 }
Despd 17 } January 1890.

No. 3587
Enclo: ~~10~~ 11

Contractor Aroo-mooga Chetty.

Explains the circumstances under which the Security money was not recovered from —

From
THE EXECUTIVE ENGINEER,
NILGIRI DIVISION.
To
THE SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
4TH CIRCLE.

Dated
Despatched
Received } 188 .

No.

Enclosures.

Subject.

No. 18/E.W.

Submitted to the Chief Engineer P.W.D. with reference to his Endorsement No. 782 D. of 30th August/89, addressed to Col: Ross Thompson R.E., through this Office.

2 All original papers are herewith returned.

Peter Campbell Major R.E.,
Supg Engr 4th Circle.

Camp Gudalur
22nd January 1890

From

The Supg. Engr.
4th Circle

No. 3595 W of 18-12-89
" 2568 W - 17-9-89
" 782 B - 30-8-89
" 3602 C - 10-8-89
" 5420 C - 21-11-89
" 1748 W - 2-7-89
" 235 W - 29-1-89
" 2855-6 W - 13-9-88
" 2041 C - 17-6-87
" 746 W - 5-3-88
" 4023 C - 11-11-87
" 2[illegible]1C - 9-7-87
" 2769 W - 21-10-86

Dated 22nd }
Despd 23rd } January 90

Recd 27-1-90

No. 454 W of 11 Feby 1890

A 18/EW

Enclos 10.

Contractor Arumugum Chetty

Submitting letter in original from the Executive Engr. Nilgiris explaining the circumstances under which the security money was not recovered from —

H.W. 3-2-90 R 6-2-90

---

90 761 454/19

Dw 454 W / 11-2-90

Incoming.

The loss of Rs 253-12-- on account of lime issued to Contractor Arumuga Chetty was adjusted under G.O. No 3595 W of 18.12.89. & it now only remains to consider the question of blame to be attached to the officers concerned.

Arumuga Chetty [illegible] admittedly a man of straw. He was given contracts to finish up works at the end of the official year, when the previous contractor had failed. He appears to have been taken on hurriedly, without due consideration, & the question of taking security from him was overlooked.

- 454 W [illegible]

Col. Ross Thompson admits this to be his fault & expresses regret.

Col. Thompson further says that if the sub-divisional officer had noted on the contractor's bills the amount to be recovered for materials supplied, the loss would not have occurred.

These two omissions no doubt caused [illegible]

[illegible]

30-1-90

The explanation is not altogether satisfactory, and there is no reason why it should not have been sent in long ago. [illegible] the [illegible] has referred to in R.T. No 782 D of 30th Aug 89, & the explanation, being merely an expression of regret might have been offered without such delay

---

P.W.D.

454/20

Office note from the Dy. P.W. Accounts No 1081 of 1-8.89.
Letter from the S.E. V Circle No 3400 of 18.8.89.
" " ——do—— —— 4841 of 24.10.89
Office note from the Dy. Ac. Accounts. 1753 of 6-12-89
Order of Govt. No 3595 W of 18.12.89.
Letter from the S.E. IV Circle No 18 Dw. of 22.1.90.

For orders.

These papers relate to a loss of Rs 253-12-", which occurred in the Presidency division at the end of the official year 1887-88.

The facts of the case are briefly as follows.

2 In February 1888, the contractor for petty civil works in the Presy. division having failed, a man named Armooga Chetty was put on as contractor until the close of the official year.

3 Armooga Chetty received lime to the value of Rs 403-12-" from the Govt. lime kilns in March 1888, but his bills were paid in full at the end of

official year, leaving the
ne of the lime unadjusted.
Subsequently, by dint
repeated dunning, a sum
Rs 150 was recovered from
man, leaving Rs 253-12-
adjusted. It was at first
proposed to sue him for
balance, but it was
iscovered that he was a
auper, & Col. Burton thought
t legal proceedings would
throwing good money after
ad -

Armooga Chetty appears
have been taken on at the
d of the official year, without
y consideration as to his means,
the question of taking
ecurity from him was
ltogether lost sight of.

In a letter to the Secy
o 2721 of 22.7.89. Col. Burton
ported that the loss was due
neglect of duty or careless-
ess on the part of the Ex.
gineer & Accountant.

In endt No 182 D of
August 1889. Col. Ross Thompson
s called on for explanation,
his reply has only now been
eceived.

Col. Thompson admits
hat the neglect to take security
om the man was his fault,
& expresses regret.

With regard to the

---

payment of the Contractor's
bill, Col. Thompson says that
if the sub divisional officer
had noted on it, as he should
have done, the deduction
to be made on account of
lime issued, the deduction
would of course have been
made, - but that this was not
brought to his notice either
by the Accountant or the
sub divisional officer -

10 The name of the sub
divisional officer concerned
is not given, but the
accountant, Mr Dunphy,
has since been dismissed

In G.O. No 3595 W of
18.12.89. permission was
given to adjust the loss
in the accounts, and the
question of blame and
responsibility has now
to be considered:-

Col. Thompson's ex=
planation does not ap=
pear to be satisfactory
& there appears to be no
reason why it he took
five months to submit
it.

W.C.S.
1.2.90

Rich
1.2.90

W

Col. Ross Thompson was the res-
ponsible officer and must be
censured. His explanation
is unsatisfactory.

W.S.
5 Feb

Ans

For orde

Loss on Govt lim
supplies to

P. 454 W

No. 454 W. of 11 Feby 1890.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

454/22

P.W./

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following

Office note from the Ag. P.W.d.	At No. 1081 d/ 1st August 1889
Letter from the Supdg. Engr. V Circle	„ No. 2400 d/ 18th August 1889
—— do —— do ——	„ No. 4841 d/ 26th October 1889
Office note from the Ag. P.W.d.	„ No. 1755 d/ 6th December 18
Order of Govt. in the P.W.D.	„ No. 3595 W d/ 18th December 18
Letter from the Supdg. Engr. IV Circle	„ No. 18 E.W. of 22nd January

These papers relate to loss of Rs. 253-12-0, which occurred in the Presidency division at the end of the official year 1887-88.

2. In February 1888, the contractor for petty Civil works in the Presidency division having failed, a man named Arumooga Chetty was appointed Contractor until the end of the official year.

Rec
8 Feb

3. Arumooga Chetty received lime to the value of Rs. 403-12 from the Govt. lime kilns in March 1888, but his bills were paid in full at the end of the official year leaving the value of the lime unadjusted.

4. Subsequently a sum of Rs. 150 was recovered from the man, leaving Rs. 253-12 unadjus

unadjusted and irrecoverable.

5. Armoaga Chetty appears to have been taken on at the end of the official year, without any consideration as to his means, and the question of taking security from him was altogether lost sight of.

6. In a letter to the Examiner No. 2721 of 22nd July 1889 Colonel Burton reported that the loss was due to neglect of duty or carelessness on the part of the Ex. Engineer and Accountant.

7. In endorsement No. 782 D of 30th August 1889, Col: Ross Thompson was called on for explanation and his reply has only now been received.

8. Col. Thompson admits that the neglect to take security from the man was his fault, and expresses regret.

9. With regard to the payment of the Contractor's bill, Col. Thompson says that if the sub divisional officer had noted on it, as he should have done, the deduction to be made on account of lime wasted the deduction would of course have been made, but tha
to his notice either
Accountant or the
divisional officer.

10. The name of ~~23~~ 454 the su
divisional officer concer
is not given, but the Ac
countant, Mr. Dumphy
has since been dismis

11. The Govt. considers that Col. Ross Thompson's explanation, which he took five months to submit, is unsatisfactory, and that the loss to public funds is due to want of care on his part. In G.O. No. 3595 W. of 18th Decr. 1889, permission was granted to adjust the loss in the accounts.

454/23

W.C.R.
7.2.90

Rvd
7-2-90

To The Supdg. Engr. V Circle
" Supdg. Engr. IV Circle

Desd
14/2/90

CM

Issue

Draft
for approval

No 454 to [illegible] 11 Feby 189[illegible]

Issue

[illegible]

10 812/2.