

- (1) பக்கங்களின் எண்ணிக்கை 2
 (2) புதுக்கித் திருப்பிய நாள் 6.90.
 (3) ஆதாரங்குறிப்பவர் சுருக்கொப்பம் 1000

தமிழ்நாடு ஆவணக் காப்பகம்.

தமிழ்நாடு அரசு

மெய்யப்பன் துறை

அரசாணை எண். மு. கோப்புத் தாள் எண்.	1795	அச்சகம் பலவகை
நாள் :	10. 7. 1893	108

முடிக்கவோ கண்டபடி கையாளவோ கூடாது

3. செப்டி.

No. 810 G. D

FROM

G. D. Wylerowdy
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

1795
FIRST CIRCLE.

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Enclosures. /

1. Draft plaint

DOWLAISHWERAM, 24th June 1893.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit herewith a draft plaint drawn up by a Government Tahil in order to recover an over-payment of Rs 83-12-0 from Kadiem Tenkatarreddi, & to request that you will be so good as to obtain the necessary sanction of Government for the institution of a suit against him, in the Coena-mada Sub Court, at Government expense.

2. The circumstances connected with the case are briefly these:- An inspection shed was built, at Bendamurlanka in Central Section of Godavari Western Division, on piece work system, at sanctioned estimate rates, by the defendant. The work was commenced in February 1890, & completed in March 1892. During this period, its charge was held by 2 Sectional Subordinates, viz. P. Narasimharow Naidu Overseer in charge Razole Section, & R. Tydyanattu Aiyar Sub-Engineer in charge Rall

Section, the Sub Divisional officer being throughout, Mr. Howley Assistant Engineer. In March 1891, a part payment was made to the piece worker on the Overseer's Bill which had included a sum of Rs. 85-12-0 on account of plastering work. In the final Bill made & submitted by the Sub-Engineer in March 92, he included the above item, in ignorance of the previous payment, and without reference to the last Bill, which included it & this bill was paid by the Sub D^r officer.

3. This double payment was detected in the Divisional office in April 1892 & the Sub Divisional officer was called upon to recover it at once. All his steps to recover the over-payment from the defendant were fruitless. Since he would neither remit the money, nor meet the Sub Divisional officer, in spite of his written notices. From the file of papers, I observe that the reason for the defendant's non-appearance was probably that he was ordered to remove the doors & windows, that had been condemned for bad workmanship. This, he refused to do. but as the work had to be completed within the official year, new doors & windows were made & substituted in March 1892 for the condemned ones, & the cost, had of course, to be deducted from the payment due to the defendant.

4. Explanations were also obtained from the parties concerned as to how the ~~second~~ payment escaped notice. Mr.

Howley states that it was through a clerical error by extreme pressure of work at the end of the official year. While the Sub Eng^r who initiated the final bill pleads ignorance of previous payment, as the information furnished by the Overseer at the time of handing over charge of the work, was too meagre to prevent errors.

5. Under these circumstances, I consider, that the recovery cannot be effected without recourse to a Court of law, as there is every reason to believe that the suit proposed to be filed is such as to carry with it a fair prospect of success.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most Obedient Servant

J. D. Howley.
Sup^r Eng^r 1st Circle

27-6-

FROM

G. D. Wyllow Esquire
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

12-1495 Waf 10 & by 15

DATED 24th
DISPATCHED 28th } June 1893.
RECEIVED 1-7-93.

No. 810 G. D.

14/4/94

The prosecution of
the suit is sanctioned

ENCLOSURES 1

SUBJECT.

Draft plaint drawn up
to recover an overpayment
made to Kadiam Venkata-
reddi for work done on
Bendamurauka Inspection
shed - Submitting the
and requesting to obtain
sanction of Government
for the institution of a
suit against him in
the Sub-Court at Cocanada

37

37-43

DESPATCHED
10 JUL 93

en

28/7 24/7

S. I. Circle with receipt
Ear. S. W. Leck

2.C. 11/10

With O. S.

08/12/6
Hm 3-7. 22/7-