[G/9]

P. L. CURRENT No. 7301

S. E. I. / 6 —500—31-7-94

FROM

A. H. Garrett Esq
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DATED 1894
DESPATCHED 24 September 1894
RECEIVED 1-10-94

No. 1221 RD

ENCLOSURES, 1

SUBJECT.

Jamia Sahib & Co Contractors Returns the petition from & invites attention to letter Office No. 488 RD dt 2-6-94

No. 2866 C dt 11-9-94
" 2178 C dt 11-6-94
" 605 C dt 10-2-94
No. 2705 W dt 26-9-89

No. 2586 W dt 16th October 94

B
W

The petitioners the petitioners are informed that the Govt declines to interfere in the matter of their claim. their claim

DESPATCHED
16 OCT. 94

D.C.C
19/10

To the Petitioners
Thro' Petitioners Contr.
S.E. I Circle
S.D.O. I Circle

6/11

Reference O.L. 395

No. 1221 G.D.

FROM

A. H. Garrett Esq
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER

FIRST CIRCLE.

Enclosures, 1

C. Cir. to 2866 C 11-9-94

TO

THE CHIEF ENGINEER

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

DOWLAISHWERAM, 19 September 1894.

SIR,

× hereunto returned.

With reference to your No. 2866 C. dated the 11th September 1894 on × petition from Jaina Sahib & Co Contractors I have the honor to invite your attention to this office letter No. 488 G.D. dated the 2nd June 1894 & your Memorandum No. 2178 C. dated the 11th June 94.

2. I find that your Memo was not forwarded to the petitioners as it was thought that you had communicated with them sending a copy of your Memo to this office.

3. If this was not done and you intended your Memo to be forwarded to the petitioners through this office it will explain them again applying to you.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
your most Obedient Servt

Supdg Engr

Copy of this minute was sent direct to the petitioners. The present petition is addressed to Govt. The previous petitions should now be sent to Govt with the present petition.

In

[G/9] 790—24-7-94.

M. CURRENT No. 6802

Current No. 2408

Public DEPARTMENT.

From Jaina Sahib & Co Contractors residing in Dowlaishwaram No. in Godavari Dt.

Dated 30/7
Received 24/8 1894.
Enclosures 6.

Rec'd at Dot. V.R.R.

SUBJECT.

Complaining of the loss sustained by the petrs in Con: with the erection of the Amalapur district Munsiff's Court building —

No. 2866C. dt/11 September 1894.

Referred to the Superintending Engineer, I Circle, for report.

Col. R.E.
Chief Engineer, P.W.D.

7166 CIRCLE

Copies 7/94

To The Supdg. Engineer, I Circle — to be returned.

Sundry papers

8 — 47 / 1579

335

Referred.

Department.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT. MADRAS.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper :—

3

letter written
of the ~~report submitted~~ by Mr. Martin
the Division Officer - If the above
letter is sent for by Govt., its con-
-tents will be known.

The Range officer told the petrs
that cheques could not be issued
in the names of more than one
person & the petrs consequently
requested that cheques be
issued in the name of one of
their creditors - The Munsiff's Court
building was completed in Oct.
1892 and the last payment was
made in March 1893 - A sum of Rs 800
& odd was due to them in
respect of the erection of the
Amalapur Dt. Munsiff's
Court building & the Rajavole
Dt Talvs office building -
A cheque (for which amount
not stated) was issued in the
name of the creditor referred
to above who knowing nothing
about the works done by the
petrs gave a receipt to the
effect that he had received
money in accordance with
the rates entered in the
(petrs') tenders.

A loss of Rs 350 accrued to
the petrs because Mr Lewis
sent for a larger quantity
of paint than was required
for the above building.

The petrs presented 2 peti-
-tions to the Supl Engrs
(regarding the losses sustained by them)
The petitions were referred to
the Division officer who made
a false report that he had
written to the petrs asking
them to receive the sum of
Rs 1000 deposited by them
Rs 400 & odd being the
value of materials erected
by them & cancel their contract.
The petrs would certainly
have accepted the above terms
if they had been really
offered to them.

The petrs submitted peti-
-tions to the Superintend-
-ing Engr by registered
post on the 20th June, 5th
Augt & 30th Septr 1893, but
have not been favored with
replies.

The petrs pray that
the Govt will send for
& peruse the correspond-
-ence that took place
in April 1894 between the
Supl Engr & the division
officer on the subject
of this petition that it
will also peruse the list
attached to this petition
showing the items of loss
sustained by the petitioners
in consequence of the
delay in the selection
of the site of the Amalapur
Dt Munsiff's Court build-
-ing, and that the petrs
may be reimbursed
their loss to such
an extent as the
Govt may deem fit.

T. 4/9

2

Salaries of men
employed to watch
the timber collected
by the petitioners.

The teak wood
materials which at first
had been measured by the
Subdivision officer &
approved of by the Division
officer were rejected
subsequently on the score
of that damage
was caused to them by the sun
& rain in consequence
of the delay in commencing
the work, and the petrs
had to purchase fresh materials.

Lime, said etc were
damaged by rain, and
60 instead of 37 garces
of lime were used in
the erection of the building -

The petitioners addressed
the Division officer &
the Supl Engr on the 17th
April 1890 and 21st Febr
1891 respectively regarding
the great loss sustained
by them. Unauthenticated
Copies of the replies
of the above officers
are submitted herewith -

On the 18th Augt 1890,
the petrs forwarded a
petition to Mr Martin
who however sent them
no reply. The petrs do
not know the contents of

7

7 See the Office Note dated 31/5/94 post this
with No (3) 2653 dt 29/4/94

The petitioners state as follows:-

In January 1890 the contract for the Erection of the Court Building at Anuradhapura was given to the petitioners - As the site lying close to a certain channel was originally selected for the erection of the building the petitioners offered to execute the work for a sum which is Rs 3000 less than the Estimated cost, in view of the small expenditure that would be incurred on account of water etc - The petrs then collected materials within 3 months - On the 27th March 1890 Mr Lewis gave orders to commence the work and went to England - The owner of the above site afterwards objected to it being taken up for the building on the ground that the Range officer did not pay him adequate compensation, and the result was that 3 other sites were selected successively & 2 years elapsed before the work was commenced - This delay was caused by the Engineer - The petrs consequently sustained losses as described below -

3000 Rs being interest on the loan raised by the petrs for the erection of the building -

Salaries

[illegible]

270 — — [illegible] be done as per estimate. He applied for [illegible] intended the water [illegible] work [illegible]. As per revised estimate [illegible] of work done. Paid only Rs. 13 — [illegible] for that amount at that rate [illegible] Govt. to Sub Registrar's office work.

50 — — Foundations were ordered for [illegible] more depth as per revised estimate & the soil being sandy [illegible] loose, excess charge was incurred by [illegible].

75 — — Loss on tiles. After all the tiles got as per measurements given by Mr. Lewis & stacked at site, another measurements given [illegible] them to a loss.

243 — — Interest for Deposit Rs. 600 — for 2 years [illegible]

CHIEF SECRETARY
27 AUG 1894
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

200—0—0. Loss of 10 Yards of lime frozen and mixed with earth as the land is too low being near the canal side owing to delay of land at the beginning. C.Y. 37 of lime was estimated for the whole work & was given to us & to ~~estimated~~ utilized by us including the lime bought by us.

180—0—0. Loss of cost rea. of lime. The data in the specification is 2 sand & 1 lime, but we were ordered to work with 1½ sand & 1 lime according to the subsequent order by us. 805 of work was done up to 8 over basement. C.Y. 7 of lime was excessively used. Loss on Drip batter. The tiles could not stay without it. It was a necessary work, as it was not omitted in only 2 estimates of our contracts.

97—0—0. Loss of interest in delay of payment for Rs. 1000 from 1-10-92 to March/93 for 6 Months

120—0—0. Do do of payment Rs. 1000 + 1000. Deposit 1st on 1-10-92 to end of December/92 for 3 Months.

122—6—0. Loss of wood owing to delay. We collected at site of work C.ft. 680 instead of estimated amount C.ft. 884 & the same was measured as C.ft. 884 marked for the less measurements. We replied that it would be settled when the work was fixed. We took 200 C.ft. from workshop & 218 by us. Left 246 was written out & we escaped from fear of fire.

28—0—0. Loss on 4 windows. At first measurements we given us so we had to make them again.

123—0—0. Loss of store watchers pay for Rs. 195 for 32½ months instead of Rs. 72 for 12 Months.

205—0—0. Loss of gunmaster pay Rs. 325 for 32½ from the rate of Rs. 120 for 12 Months.

[illegible]

1500—0—0. Loss of [illegible]
for 2 years

350—0—0. Loss on [illegible]
Rs. 120 for [illegible]
[illegible]

To. Messrs. Jaina Sahebs & Co.
Dowlaishwaram.

From. W. C. Lewis Esquire
Executive Engineer

22-10-90. Late Godavari Central Division
W. C. Lewis is very sorry to hear
of the trouble that has occured with
reference to the paint for Amalapar
Munsiff's court, but as he
only acted for J. J. & Co. to help
them to avoid the consequences
of their own unreadiness to fulfill
their ~~unreadiness~~ contract
he cannot interfere between
them & the officers now incharge

(Signed) W. C. Lewis.
Executive Engineer

England
22-10-90.

(True copy)

Left on 4 windows. At first measurements we
given so we had to make them again.

On Petition of Jaina Saheb & Co. Contractors requesting to take the excess oils indented erroneously by Mr. Lewis.

Endorsement.

No. 21. A.

I am afraid I cannot help petitioners on this subject at all. Mr. Lewis certainly seems to have indented for more than petitioners asked him they must therefore get satisfaction from him.

(Signed) B. H. Young.
Executive Engineer
Godavari Western Division
23rd August 1890.
(True copy)

x opr on 4-4 and 0-7½ first measurements we given us so we had to make them again.

No. C
18.
D. & D. W.

From.

W. C. Lewis Esquire
Executive Engineer
Godavari Central Division

To.

Jaina Saheb
Contractor.

Camp - Ralli.
Dated - 27th } March 1890.
Desp^d. 27th }
Enclosures -
Reference.

With reference to his petition dated 7th. March 1890, he is informed that orders have been given to mark out foundations

(Signed) W. C. Lewis.
Executive Engineer
Godavari Central Division

Comp^d.
Initialled J.S.
27-3-90.

Copied
(Initialled) J.S.
27-3-90.

(True copy)

gence & to be had to make them apace.

Left of store watcher's pay for Rs: 195 - for 32½ months instead of Rs: 72 - for 12 months.

Left of gumastas pay Rs: 325 for 32½ months instead of Rs: 120 for 12 months.

Left of pay of 2 Sub-overseers posted [illegible] work Rs: 120 for 32½ months for [illegible] instead of Rs [illegible] for [illegible]

Left of [illegible]
for [illegible]

Left on account of [illegible]
Rs: 1300 but [illegible]
of them to [illegible]

No. C
D.P.W.

From.

W. C. Lewis Esquire

To Petition of Jamna Kahelia & Co. Contractors stating that they are going to a considerable loss owing to delay of land.

Endorsement

Orders will be given to commence the work as soon as the Judge has approved of the site now selected.

(Signed) G. W. Hopkins
Superintending Engineer
Godavari Central Division.

23rd February 1891.
Recd. 23rd.

(True copy)

He is informed that orders have been given as to mark out foundations

(Signed) W. C. Lewis.
Executive Engineer
Godavari Central Division.

Compd.
Initialled
Checked
(Initialled)

(True copy)

Left of store watcher's pay for Rs: 195 - for 32½ months instead of Rs: 72 - for 12 months.

Left of gumaster's pay Rs: 325 - for 32½ months instead of Rs: 120 - for 12 months.

Left of pay of 2 labourers hired for the work Rs: 1200 for 2 months instead of Rs: 240 - for 12 months.

Left of cartage for 2 years.

Left of contingencies Rs: 1200 for 2 years.