

(1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை

(2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள்

(3) ஆதாரங் குறிப்பவர் கருக்கொப்பம்

4
July 1891
3

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

சுயை

அரசாணை எண்.

மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.

3081

அச்சகம்

பலவகை

நாள் :

23. 11. 1892

199

மடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது.

8.6.2
சுயை

ஆவண. கா. 1-18,006-6-9-90.

3081

14TH NOVEMBER 1893, No. 2544 L., LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

LOCAL AND MUNICIPAL DEPARTMENT.

READ—again the following paper:—

G.O., dated 11th August 1893, No. 1770 L., Local and Municipal.

READ—also the following papers:—

Ref. on Regr. No. 123-Govt.

Public Works circle.	District.	Item No.	Name of work.	Amount of estimate or items chargeable.	Remarks.
1	2	3	4	5	6
V.	South Arcot.	9	Causeway across the Maltattar near Panruti, Cuddalore taluk.	Rs. 9,790	An estimate of Rs. 10,545 was submitted for sanction with this office letter, No. 177, dated 5th May 1893. Probably the amount of the estimate has been cut down after scrutiny to Rs. 9,790. The estimate falls under I (a) of the rules. The charge for scrutiny comes to Rs. 244-12-0, as according to the said rule it should be calculated "on the amount of the estimates as submitted to the Superintending Engineer."

CUDDALORE,
22nd August 1893.

(Signed) M. HAMMICK,
President, District Board.

To the Chief Secretary to Government, with reference to
G.O., dated 11th August 1893, Mis. No. 1770 L.

From the President, District Board, Madura, dated 24th August 1893, No. 85.

ABSTRACT.—Reporting that the statement enclosed in G.O., dated 11th August 1893, Mis. No. 1770 L., has been verified and found correct.

From G. F. T. POWER, Esq., President, District Board, South Canara, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Mangalore, 28th August 1893, No. 1276.

With reference to G.O., dated the 11th instant, Mis. No. 1770 L., I have the honour to state that the statement received therewith has been duly verified and found correct.

2. Under paragraph 2 (I) (b) of G.O., dated 29th April 1889, No. 1137 W., recorded in G.O., dated 15th June 1889, No. 1360 L., there is to be no fresh charge for scrutiny "when the alteration is due to change of quantities or rates and not of design." From the comparative statement showing the difference between the original and the revised estimate of the Muluhalla bridge, herewith submitted, it will be seen that there was no change in the design and I think no scrutiny charge is, therefore, due on the amount shown in the statement received with the Government Order under reply.