

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 14
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 6/8/2
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 2

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

P. ம. சி துறை

109

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	2079	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் : 26 - 7 - 1892 198 .		

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

7. Sheets

ஆவண. கா-1-18,006-15-6-87.

[Handwritten signature]

From W. Jopp Esq. Executive Engineer,
Kistna Eastern Division to the Supt,
Engineer, 2nd Circle, No 722 of 19.5.92.

20th

Under your orders a dredge
and two punts were despatched to
Bandar before the close of the Canals
in order to be able to carry out the
dredging of the tidal Creek below the
Bandar Lock, which the Marine Dept
had requisitioned the department to do.

Secy remark

x Since returned
unpassed with
the Presidency
Port Officer's No
1412 of 10.5.92.
75

2. An estimate for the work was
prepared and submitted to you with my
letter No 5574 of 10.2.92, but before order
had been passed on it, the work of ~
dredging had been commenced & liability
amounting to Rs 213.9.6 incurred owing to
some misunderstanding on the part of the
Head Quarter's Division Officer.

As soon as it came to my knowledge,
work was immediately stopped.

The expenditure represents cost
of conveyance of the dredge to Bandar

and the value of labor & small stores.

3. The estimate has been returned by the Marine Department unsanctioned, and they intimate that the P.W. & will not be called upon to carry out the work. In these circumstances, I have the honor to request that you will be so good as to lay these facts before the Presidency Port Officer, & ask him to accept the charges amounting to Rs. 213.9.6 which at present appear on my statement.

N^o 513 KS d/ 26.5.92.

Forwarded to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras, with reference to his N^o $\frac{1412}{75}$ of 10 May 1892 & with a request that the Landing & Shipping Dues Committee may be requested to refund the expenditure of Rs 213.9.6 incurred by this Department as above stated.

(Sd) J. H. A. M. an
Suptg Engineer
2nd Circle

From H. J. Brown Esq. Asst. Port Officer, Masulipatam to the Suptg Engineer, 2nd Circle. N^o $\frac{16}{273}$ of 8 June 1892.

20th
A Copy of a letter from the Executive Engineer, Krishna Eastern Division, & your endorsement thereon regarding the dredging operations carried out in the tidal creek below the Bandar Lock has been sent to me for reference.

There seems to have been some misunderstanding about the work, & I beg to ask you by whose Authority, the work was commenced as the Presidency Port Officer informs me the work was not sanctioned by him, and I can find no reference to the subject in this office.

This information is required so that the matter may be put before the Landing & the Shipping Dues Committee with a view to the charges of Rs 213.9.6.

on account of the Public Works Order
being met from the Masulipatam
Landreign & Shipping fees.

From J. Hannan Esq. Supt. Engineer,
2nd Circle to the Port Officer Masulipatam
dated 15 June 1892, No 709 K.S.

In reply to your letter No ¹⁵/₂₇₃
7.6.92, I have the honor to state
the dredging was commenced owing
to misconception of orders. In
anticipation of the estimate for dredging
being sanctioned, the dredge was
ordered to be despatched for the purpose
to Bunder before the closure of the Canals.
On the arrival of the dredge, the subordinate
in charge started the work under the
impression that the estimate which he
submitted had been sanctioned.
The dredge, however, was only despatched
to be in readiness in case the estimate
was sanctioned, as otherwise, the work

could not be gone on with
until the Canals were opened.

204
From the Port Officer, Masulipatam
to the Presidency Port Officer, Madras.
dated 25 June 1892, No ¹⁵/₃₀₂.

With reference to your Memorandum
No ¹⁴¹²/₈₂₈ dated 3 June 1892, I have
the honor to inform you that after
consultation with the Collector of the
District I by his advice wrote
to the Superintending Engineer of the
2nd Circle asking him on whose
authority the dredging alongside
the quay wall was carried out.

In his reply he states that the
dredging was commenced owing to
misconception of orders by some of his
subordinates, & that the dredge was
sent down to Bunder in anticipation
of the work being sanctioned.

This letter was received on the

16. Instant when at my instigation as Ag. President of the Committee, a meeting of the Landing & Shipping dues Committee was arranged for for the 25th Instant, that being the earliest date it was convenient for all the members to attend.

At this meeting, they state that they decline to pay the amount incurred viz, Rs 213.9.6 for the following reasons.

1st. Because the work was not done by the orders of the Presidency Port officer or any one in any way connected with the Port or with the responsibility of the Carrying out of Act III of 1885.

2nd. Because the work was commenced & finished before the Act III of 1885 was in force here, or the Landing & Shipping dues Committee in existence.

I beg to remark that I think there is reason in these objections, especially as the P.W. department admit that the work was done by mistake & without orders.

No 1412 P.W.
120

207
14 July

Copy forwarded to the Suptg Engineer, 2nd Circle for information. The Presidency Port Officer regrets that under the circumstances, he is unable to comply with the request contained in the Suptg Engineer's Communication No 513 of 26 May 1892.

Presidency Port Officer } 147 Illegible
Madras, 14 July 1892 } For Presidency Port Officer

No 955 Ho dated 12th July 1892

Forwarded to the Chief Engineer, P.W. department, for favor of orders regarding the adjustment of the expenditure already incurred, viz, Rs 213.9.6.

W. H. M. M. M.

14.7.92 Suptg Engineer 2nd Circle

From
The Supg Engineer
2nd of India

To
The Chief Engineer
P. W. Dept
Madras

For orders whether
the expenditure
may be debited
to Provincial
funds, - Subhead,
Misc: Public Improvements.

Dated 12th July 1892
Recd. 15.7.92
No. 955 Ko.

Tidal Creek at Masulipatanam - dredging the - Kharas
for favor of orders Copies
of correspondence in the
matter of - with a request
as to how the adjustment
of the amount expended is to
be effected.

107
15.7.92
Nothing is to be done, but who
should be responsible for it? The
proposed estimate is not
clearly stated without order.
How much is for dredging?
1400
22.7.92

Che 7295
19

This stated that
the Marine Dept
requisitioned this
Dept to carry out
the dredging operations.
A copy of this
requisition should
have been forwarded

5041
15.7.92
2079
19

J. O. debiting the
amount as per usual
debiting the 2
report now made
of the stage is for
stufing and now
made for running
the stage, and for
explaining the
nature of the
mineral water
which the water was
the same as the other water in
page, and collected
the water as a portion
of the explanation should
not be made from the

207
D. H. 6
217

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

207
Read the following

From the S E II file (H.E. No 955 K.S. d/12. vii. 92)

The expenditure will be debited to Provincial funds - Subhead, Miscellaneous Public Improvements.

2. The Suptg Engineer will report how much of the charge is for dredging and how much for moving the dredger. He will also explain the nature of the mis-understanding

under which the work
was begun, and
report the names
of the officers and
subordinates responsible,
and whether the
whole or a portion
of the expenditure
should not be
recovered from them.

8013

2179

S
2179

No 2079. W. 2/26 July 91

Remt. issued to 2079 W. 4

✓

(7)

II.
S. E. ~~file~~ file
P. M. C. 2/26