

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 24
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 10/11/80
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் lon

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

PWD துறை

102

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	819	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	11-3-1882	198

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

12 Sheets 80%

No 722

Executive Engineer's office
Coimbatore 27th February 1892

From

J. C. Lammie Esq
Executive Engineer
Coimbatore Division

To.

819/
The Superintending Engineer
Fourth Circle

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your Memo No 90th of the 16th Instant disallowing portions of my travelling allowance for December and January last and to express my extreme surprise that you should
1st Consider it necessary at all to disallow them, and
2nd that having first sanctioned the journeys in question in your Nos 11th of 9th January and 62nd of 5th February, you should 38 and 11 days afterwards - presumably while on tour in the North Arcot District, disallow them.

2 I returned to Coimbatore on the 2nd December after a long tour in the Erode Sub. Division.

3 During my absence certain levels and surveys required in connection with the restoration of the new ghāt bridges had been prepared, but on looking into them, I found several discrepancies and inaccuracies which rendered a visit to both bridge sites absolutely necessary, further information to adapt the bridge designs to the localities was also required and accordingly on the 10th December I went up the ghāt to Coonoor, having obtained and settled with the overseer the necessary requirements.

4 The 12th December, I spent at Coonoor and obtained from the Chief Engineer of the Railway some useful information as to rates etc. and settled on some questions affecting the ghāt. On
(Sunday)

*Vide G.O. No.
333 W of 4 Feb. 1892

(Sunday) the 13th I proceeded on to Ootacamund and left in on the 6th of January so that, irrespective of the Xmas holidays, I was there just 8 days.

5 Not alone during this period but also through the holidays I carried on work, inspected the various works, examined the Sub. Division office, and completed my rough plans and report for the ghāt bridges. 8/19/2

6 Under circumstances of this kind, I can hardly believe that Government would consider para 1224 of the Civil Service Regulations as applicable to the case. I had fully 8 days' work in the Sub. Division and the Xmas holidays cannot be held to count.

7 I have been most particular and I consider moderate in making claims for travelling allowance on the Hills; As a matter of fact the total amount I

I draw barely covers my expenses.

8 On several occasions, I would have been perfectly justified in claiming allowance while halting, inspecting works at Oota-cannund and on the Ghat.

E. G. At the end of October after the occurrence of the damages, I had to wait for about a week pending inspections by the Chief Engineers. Allowances for this period would have been more than the paltry sum you now disallow, but, I have only claimed, when proceeding to the Nilgiri Sub-Division, for the actual days travelled.

9 That my management of work on the Ghat has met with approval, I need only refer you to G. O. No. 3116 N of 19th November and No. 3433 N of 19th December 1891. I have not been up and down oftener than the importance of the Sub-Division requires. (My most im-
portant

important Sub-Division now that no funds are available for the Kalugaroogan Channel). 8/7/3

10 During the whole course of my twenty-three years' service, never before has any Superintending Engineer under whom I have served, considered it necessary to disallow any travelling allowance I have claimed. That such a course should now, without sufficient reason, be adopted, almost amounts to a reflection on my character, which I cannot allow to pass unchallenged.

11 I must therefore request you, if you cannot allow your original sanctions to hold good, to refer the question, with this letter, for the Chief Engineer's orders.

12 During the next few months, I shall have frequent occasion to go up the Ghat, at all events as far as Benhope or Coonoor and it is to be hoped that long explanations like this will not be required

* No. 11 of 9th January and 62 of 5th Febry.

required on each occasion.

I have the honor to be
Sir,

Your most obedient servant

J. C. Lawrence
Executive Engineer

Coimbatore Division

27/2

819
/4



From

J. C. Larmenie Esq
Executive Engineer
Coimbatore Dist

To

The Supg. Engineer
4th Circle
Coimbatore

Dated 27th }
Despatches 27 } February 1892

No 722

Travelling allowances—
Submits explanations
on the disallowance of—
to and from Cozy in December
1891 and January 1892.

P.S. 2
24/2/92

No 90
Ct.

Supg. Engineer's Office, 4th Circle,
Coimbatore 16th February 1892.

Memorandum.

Travelling allowance Bill of Coimbatore
Division for January 1892. *Sy/*

The travelling allowance claimed
for journey up the Nilgiri Hills in last
December and back in January on
behalf of the Executive Engineer is
disallowed with reference to article
1224 of Civil Service Regulations. The
claim preferred in the Bill for January
has been struck out and the amount
passed in December should be retrenched
in the next Bill.

Signed/ P. A. C. Drake Brockman
Ct. Col. R. S.,

Supg. Engineer 4th Circle

(True Copy)

P. A. C. Drake Brockman
Ct. Col. R. S.,

Superintending Engineer, 4th Circle.

No 105
W

Supg. Engineer's Office, Madras
Coimbatore 27. February 1892

From

Lt Col: R. A. E. Drake-Brockman R.E.,
Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle.

To

The Chief Engineer, ^{85/}
P. W. Department.

Sir,

Encls = 1.

In forwarding herewith a letter from the Executive Engineer Coimbatore Division together with my memo: on the subject, I have the honor to observe that the provisions of the C. S. Regulations are very explicit and that it was for no other reason but that I considered it my duty, that I felt obliged to disallow the claims in question.

The article 1224 of C. S. Regulations lays down that the claims if considered unwarrantable "should" be disallowed.

disallowed.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obed^t serv^t,

A. E. Drake. Buchanan,

Lt Col: R.E.,

Superintending Engineer, IV Circle.

8/9/7

From

The Supg. Engrs.
4. Circle

No. 3433W of 19-12-91
- 333 W 4-2-92

Dated 27.
Despd 29. } Feby 92
Recd: 1-3-92

Ch 105
W

Encls 2

Travelling Allowances
Forwarding letter
to from the Ex. Engineer
189 Bangalore Dm for
to & from Co. Taramund
in December 1891 and
January 1892

Read the following:—

Letter from the S.E. IV Circle No 105W of
27. 11. 92

8/9/4

FOR ORDERS.

I am exceedingly
unwilling to suggest
any interference with
a Supt. Engineer's
discretion in a matter
of this kind, but in
this case the Supt.
Engineer's action
appears so injudicious
that I am of opinion
that it should be
over-ruled.

2. In the first place
article 1224 of the C.S.
Regs does not place
the power of refusing
travelling allowance
for visits to hill stations
in the hands of the
"Controlling officer" (in

I think the Controlling Officer
is entitled to disallow all
charges which seem to him
inadmissible

Wes

this case the Suptg
Engineer) but in that
of "Local Governments
and Heads of Departments."

3. In the second
there is not the
slightest evidence
that Mr. Larmine's
stay on the Hills was
"prolonged beyond
the period required
for the performance
of his duty."

4. Apart from the
Christmas holidays,
which it is always
understood that
an officer can spend
where he pleases, subject
to the exigencies of
the service, Mr. Lar-
mine appears to
have halted at
Ootacamund for
nine days. and this
can hardly be

considered an excessive
period for a halt at
the Head Quarters of
an officers most
important ^{giving} subdivision,
where there is always
a certain amount
of work going on.
5. It is observed
that Mr. Larmine
has not claimed
daily allowance for
any portion of the
halt at Ootacamund,
but merely for the
journey there and
back, and the Suptg
Engineer has disallowed
his claim for the
whole journey, —
although as far as
Coonor at all events
it must have been
absolutely necessary
for the inspection of
the ghat.

6. An officer of
 M^r Larumie's
 standing may
 reasonably expect
 to be allowed a
 certain amount
 of discretion as to
 his movements within
 of his charge, and I
 should doubt whether
 there is a case on
 record in which a
 journey has been
 disallowed under
 such
 circumstances as
 those shown in the
 papers submitted.

S. W.

ascertain precisely what the
 retrenchment is. I am not clear
 that it does not include building
 allowance.

WLS
 4 Mar

H. 3-3-92.

FOR ORDERS.

CN^o 2242.

Note.

How: Member's remark
 dated 4th March 1892.

8/10

The following
 statement shows the
 items of retrenchment:-

Amount disallowed
 by the Suptg Engineer
 from the T. A. Bill for
 January 1892.

Daily allowance for the
 5th Jan: 92 for having
 travelled 10 miles from the A. B.
 Ootacamund to Coonoor... 7-8-0

Mileage on the 7th
 Jan: 92 for having travelled
 from Coonoor to Mettupalayam
 & thence to Coimbatore. 16
 miles @ 12 as per rule and
 5 miles @ 8 as per rule... 14-8-0

Single 1st class fare on the
 7th Jan: 92 for journey from
 Mettupalayam to Coimbatore 3-4-0

Total Rs 25-12-0

Amount to be retrenched
 from the next bill in accordance
 with the orders contained
 in Suptg Engineer's Memo.

N^o 90 C. J. dated 16th

February

Feb 92:-

Daily allowance for the 10th
Decr 1891 for having travelled
from Conkstone to Mettur - 4 a.p.
palangin 5-0-0

Meals on the 11th Decr
1891 for the journey from
Mettur palangin to
Kullar & Coomaw (the
sites for the bridges are
reported to have been
definitely fixed on
this date) 14-8-0

Daily allowance on the
12th Decr 91 for the halt
at Coomaw when the
great dimensions are
reported to have been
inspected in company
with the Engineer
Chief Engineer . . . 7-8-0

Daily allowance for the
13th Decr 91 for having
travelled from Coomaw
to Dotacamund 7-8-0

Conveyance of horse &
camp equipment on the
10th Decr 91 from
Conkstone to Mettur -
palangin 5-12-0

Total Rs 40-4-0

No halting allowance
has been claimed for

the journey to and
from ^{at Dotacamund} the hills, and
there is thus no
disallowance on this
account.

The charges seem to me unob-
jectionable & I think the
disallowance should be omitted.

Mrs
7 Mar

819/11

LL

No. 819 May 11 March 1892

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following

Letter from the S.E. IV (File No. 105 Wd/27. 11. 92)

819/p

The Government
is of opinion that as
it was necessary for
Mr. Laminie to
visit Ootacamund,
which is the head-
quarters, of his most
important sub-division,
in the ordinary
course of duty, and
as there is nothing
to show that his
stay there was pro-
longed beyond the
period necessary
for the performance
of the duty, his
claim to travelling
allowance was

Wes
G. Mear

unobjectionable
and should not have
been disallowed
under section 1224 of
the C.S. Regs.

2. The Suptg Engineer's
disallowance must
therefore be over-
ruled.

S_{8.3}

No. 819 Wd 11-3-92

10

(12)

S.E. IV mile ✓
Ex. P.W. Accts. ✓ 12/3/92

15/3